Magistri Petri Lombardi
*Arch. Episc. Parisiensis*

# Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

## LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE
**DISTINCTIO XIX.**
**Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 335-341.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi

### Pars. I.
**Cap. I.**

*De aequalitate trium personarum.*

Nunc postquam coaeternitatem trium personarum pro modulo[1] facultatis nostrae insinuavimus, iam de earundem aequalitate aliquid eloqui superest. Fides enim catholica sicut coaeternas, ita et coaequales tres personas asserit. Aequalis est enim in omnibus Patri Filius, et Patri et Filio Spiritus sanctus; quia ut Augustinus in libro de Fide ad Petrum,[2] breviter aperiens, quomodo intelligatur aequalitas, docet: « Nullus horum alium aut praecedit aeternitate aut excedit magnitudine aut superat potestate; quia nec Filio nec Spiritu sancto, . . .

[1] Ed. 1 *modico*.
[2] Cap. I. n. 4; cfr. August. libr. VI. de Trinitate c. 5. n. 7. — Paulo supra ante *Augustinus* solummodo Vat. et edd. 4, 6, 8, male addunt *ait*.

Master Peter Lombard
*Archbishop of Paris*

# The Four Books of Sentences

## THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD
**DISTINCTION 19**
Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 335-341.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

### Part I
**Chapter I.**
*On the equality of the Three Persons.*

Now after we have introduced [insinuavimus] the coeternity of the Three Persons us according to the little measure[1] of our ability, there already remains to say something of the equality of the Same. For the Catholic Faith asserts that just as (They are) coeternal, so also the Three Persons (are) coequal. For the Son is equal in all (things) to the Father, and the Holy Spirit to the Father and to the Son; because as (St.) Augustine in the book On the Faith to Peter,[2] briefly revealing, in what manner (Their) equality is understood, teaches: « None of Them either precedes the Other in eternity or exceeds (Him) in magnitude or surpasses (Him) in power; because neither than the Son or the Holy Spirit, . . .

[1] Edition 1 reads *the modicum* [modo] for *the little measure* [modulo].
[2] Chapter I, n. 4; cf. (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, Bk. VI, ch. 5, n. 7. — A little above this before *(St.) Augustine* only the Vatican edition and editions 4, 6 and 8, badly add *says* [ait].

***p. 336***

quantum ad naturae divinae unitatem pertinet, aut anterior aut maior est Pater nec Filius Spiritu sancto. Aeternum quippe et sine initio est, quod Filius de Patris natura existit; et aeternum ac sine initio est, quod Spiritus sanctus de natura Patris Filiique

as much as pertains to the unity of the Divine Nature, is the Father anterior nor greater, nor the Son than the Holy Spirit. Indeed, it is eternal and without a beginning, that the Son exists from the Nature of the Father, and it is eternal and

procedit. Ob hoc ergo tres unum recte credimus et dicimus Deum, quia una prorsus aeternitas, una immensitas, una naturaliter trium personarum est divinitas ». Ecce breviter assignavit Augustinus, in quo trium personarum consistat aequalitas, scilicet quia alia alam non excellit aut aeternitate aut magnitudine aut potestate.

without a beginning, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Nature of the Father and the Son. Because of this, therefore, we believes rightly that the Three (are) One and say that (They are) God, because in a word there is, according to nature [naturaliter], one Eternity, one Immensity, one Divinity of the Three Persons ». Behold (St.) Augustine briefly assigned, in what the equality of the Three Persons consists, namely, because One does exceed the Other either in eternity, or in magnitude, or in power.

## Cap. II.

*Quod aeternitas et magnitudo et potentia in Deo unum est, etsi videantur esse diversa.*

Cumque enumerentur ista quasi diversa, in Deo tamen unum et idem sunt, scilicet essentia divina simplex et incommutabilis. Unde Augustinus in libro septimo de Trinitate:[1] « Non alio magnus, alio Deus est, sed eo magnus, quo Deus; quia non aliud ille est magnum esse, aliud Deum esse. Eadem quippe eius magnitudo est, quae virtus, et eadem essentia, quae magnitudo ». Pater ergo et Filius simul una essentia et una magnitudo. Ita etiam et potentia Dei essentia divina est. Unde Augustinus in septimo libro Confessionum:[2] « Voluntas et potentia Dei Deus ipse est ». Aeternitas quoque Dei essentia divina est. Quod Augustinus ostendit super illum locum Psalmi:[3] *In generationem et generationem anni tui* dicens: « Est generatio generationum, quae non transit, collecta de omnibus generationibus, id est sanctis. In illa erunt anni Dei, qui non transeunt, id est aeternitas Dei. Non enim sunt aliud anni Dei, aliud ipse, sed anni Dei aeternitas Dei est. Aeternitas vero ipsa Dei substantia est, nihil habens mutabile ». Inconcusse igitur teneamus, quod unum et idem est, scilicet essentia divina, Dei aeternitas, potentia, magnitudo; et tamen consuevit Scriptura haec et his similia quasi distincta[4] ponere. In his ergo verbis trium personarum aequalitatem breviter complexus est Augustinus. Quia alius alium nec aeternitate nec magnitudine nec potentia superat. Quod autem aeternitate aliqua trium personarum aliam non excedat, supra ostensum est,[5] ubi coaeternitas trium personarum insinuata est.

## Chapter II.

*That eternity and magnitude and power in God is one, even if they seem to be diverse.*

And since these are enumerated as diverse, yet in God they are one and the Same, that is, the Divine Essence, simple and incommutable. Whence (St.) Augustine in the seventh book <u>On the Trinity</u> (says):[1] « He is not by one great, by another God, but (is) great by this, whereby (He is) God; because that "to be great" is not one (thing), "to be God" another. Indeed His magnitude is the same, which (His) virtue (is), and (His) Essence is the same, which (His) magnitude is ». Therefore the Father and the Son are simultaneously [simul] the one Essence and the one magnitude. Thus also the power of God is the Divine Essence. Wherefore (St.) Augustine in the seventh book of <u>The Confessions</u> (says):[2] « The will and power of God is God Himself ». The eternity of God is also the Divine Essence. Which (St.) Augustine shows on that passage of the Psalm:[3] *Unto generation and generation Thy years* saying: « There is a generation of generations, which does not pass away, gathered from all the generations, that is from the Saints [sanctis]. In those shall be the years of God, which do not pass away, that is the eternity of God. For the years of God are not one thing, He Himself another, but the eternity of God is the years of God. But the very eternity of God is (His) Substance, having nothing changeable ». Therefore, let us hold unshakably [inconcusse], that It is one and the Same, that is, the Divine Essence, God's Eternity, Power, Magnitude; and yet Scripture is accustomed to posit these and (those) similar to these as if distinct.[4] In

these words, therefore, (St.) Augustine briefly comprises [complexus est] the equality of the Three Persons. Because neither in eternity nor magnitude nor power does One surpass the Other. But that Anyone of the Three Persons does not exceed Another, has been shown above,[5] where the coeternity of the Three Persons was introduced.

## Cap. III.

*Quod aliqua personarum aliam non excedit magnitudine, quia non est maior una pesona quam alia, nec maius aliquid duae quam una, nec tres quam duae vel una.*

Nunc igitur superest ostendere, quod magnitudine vel potentia alius alium non excedat; et prius de magnitudine videamus. Sciendum est ergo, quia Pater non est maior Filio, nec Pater vel Filius maior Spiritu sancto, nec maius aliquid duae personae simul sunt quam una, nec tres simul maius aliquid quam duae, nec maior est essentia in tribus quam in duabus nec in duabus quam in una, quia tota est in singulis. Unde Ioannes Damascenus[6] ait: « Confitemur Deitatis naturam omnem perfecte esse in singula suarum hypostaseon, id est personarum: omnem in Patre, omnem in Filio, omnem in Spiritu sancto. Ideoque perfectus Deus Pater, perfectus Deus Filius, perfectus Deus Spiritus sanctus ».

## Chapter III

*That none of the Persons exceeds the Other in magnitude, because one Person is not greater than the Other, nor (are) Two something more than One, nor Three than Two and/or One.*

Now, therefore, it remains to show, that in magnitude and/or in power One doest not exceed the Other; and first let us see concerning magnitude. It must be known, therefore, that the Father is not greater than the Son, nor the Father and/or the Son greater than the Holy Spirit, nor Two Persons together something greater than One, nor Three together something greater than Two, nor a greater Essence in Three than in Two, nor in Two than in One, because the Whole is in Each. Wherefore (St.) John Damascene[6] says: « We confess all the Nature of the Deity to perfectly be in each one of Their Hypostases, that is, Persons: all in the Father, all in the Son, all in the Holy Spirit. And for that reason the perfect God the Father, the perfect God the Son, the perfect God the Holy Spirit ».

## Cap. IV.

*Quo modo dicitur Pater esse in Filio et Filius in Patre et Spiritus sanctus in utroque.*

Et inde est, quod Pater dicitur esse in Filio et Filius in Patre et Spiritus sanctus in utroque et singulus in singulis. Unde Augustinus in libro de Fide ad Petrum:[7] « Propter unitatem naturalem totus Pater in Filio et Spiritu sancto est, totus quoque Spiritus sanctus in Patre et Filio est. Nullus horum extra quemlibet ipsorum est propter naturae divinae unitatem ». Ecce hic aperit aliquatenus — non enim potest plene tantum ab homine reserari arcanum — ex qua intelligentia dicatur singula personarum tota esse in aliis. Unde etiam Hilarius ista interius perquirens in libro tertio de

## Chapter IV

*In what manner is the Father said to be in the Son an the Son in the Father and the Holy Spirit in Each.*

And hence it is, that the Father is said to be in the Son and the Son in the Father and the Holy Spirit in Each and Each One in Each. Whence (St.) Augustine in the book On the Faith to Peter (says):[7] « On account of the natural unity the whole Father is in the Son and Holy Spirit, the whole Holy Spirit, too, is in the Father and the Son. None of These is outside of Any of Them on account of the unity of the Divine Nature ». Behold here he reveals [aperit] to some extent — for something so arcane [tantum arcanum] cannot be fully unbolted by man — out of what understanding Each of the Persons is

Trinitate[8] ait: « Affert plerisque obscuritatem sermo Domini, cum dicit: *Ego in Patre, et Pater in me est*; nec immerito. Natura enim intelligentiae humanae rationem dicti huius non capit, nec exemplum aliquod rebus divinis comparatio humana praestabit; sed quod inintelligibile[9] est homini, Deo esse possibile est. Cognoscendum itaque atque intelligendum est, quid sit illud: *Ego in Patre, et Pater in me est*; si tamen comprehendere hoc ita ut est valebimus, ut quod . . .

---

[1] Cap. 1. n. 1.
[2] Cap. 4. n. 6. — Mox solummodo Vat. et ed. 4 male omittunt *ipse* post *Deus*.
[3] Psalm. 101, 25; Augustini Enarrat. serm. 2. n. 10. August. legit cum Septuag.: *In generatione generationem*; Magister vero iuxta Vulgatam; Vat. cum aliis edd., excepta 8, *in generatione*. — Mox Vat. et plures edd. omittunt *dicens*, contradicentibus omnibus codd. et edd. 1, 8. — Magister non verbotenus recitat Augustinum, cuius verba sunt: « Est quaedam generatio generationum; in illa erunt anni tui. Quae est ista? Est quaedam, et si bene agnoscamus, in illa erimus, et anni Dei in nobis erunt. Quomodo in nobis erunt? Quomodo ipse Deus in nobis erit; unde dictum est (I. Cor. 15, 28.), ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus. Non enim aliud anni Dei, et aliud ipse, sed anni Dei aeternitas Dei est: aeternitas ipsa Dei substantia est, quae nihil habet mutabile ». — In textu Magisteri ed. 1 pro *sanctis* legit *Spiritus sancti*, et edd. 2, 3, 5, 7, 9 *sancti*. Paulo post codd. A C *sunt* loco *erunt*.
[4] Vat. et aliae edd. contra edd. 1, 8 et cod. D perperam *distincte*.
[5] Dist. IX.
[6] De Fide orthodoxa, libr. III. c. 6. — Propositio praecedens quoad sensum et aliqua verba sumta sunt ex August. libr. VI. de Trinitate, c. 10.n. 12; vel etiam c. 8. n. 9.
[7] Cap. 1. n. 4.
[8] Num. 1. — Locus Scripturae est Ioan. 14, 11.
[9] Vat. cum ceteris edd. *non intelligibile*, contradicentibus codd. omnibus et originali. Mox post *Deo* Vat. cum edd., exceptis 1, 8 contra originale et codd. omittit *esse*.

said to be whole in the Others. Whence even (St.) Hilary, seeking eagerly after this, interiorly, says in the third book On the Trinity:[8] « The sermon of the Lord bears off obscurity from very many (of His sayings), when He says: *I (am) in the Father, and the Father is in Me*; nor undeservedly. For the nature of human intelligence does not grasp the reckoning of this saying, nor will a human comparison offer any example for divine things; but what is unintelligible[9] to man, for God is able to be [esse possibile]. And so there must be cognized and understood, what this is: *I (am) in the Father, and the Father is in Me*; if, however, we will prevail to comprehend this such as it is, that what. . .

---

[1] Chapter 1, n. 1.
[2] Chapter 4, n. 6. — Next only the Vatican edition and edition 4 badly omit *Himself* [ipse] after *God* [Deus].
[3] Psalm 101:25; (St.) Augustine's, Ennarations, sermon 2, n. 10. (St.) Augustine reads from the Septuagint: *From generation unto generation* [In generatione generationem], but Master (Peter) according to the Vulgate; the Vatican edition together with the other editions, except edition 8, reads *In generation* [in generatione]. — Next the Vatican edition and very many editions omit *saying* [dicens], with all the codices and editions 1 and 8 contradicting this. — Master (Peter) does not cite (St.) Augustine verbatim, whose words were: « There is a certain generation of generations; in those shall Thy years be. What is that (generation) of Thine? It is a certain one, and if we well acknowledge it, we shall be in it, and the years of God shall be in us. In what manner shall they be in us? In the manner in which God shall be in us; whence there has been said (1 Cor. 15:28), that God is all in all. For the years of God (are) not one thing, and He Himself another, but the eternity of God is the years of God: the eternity itself of God is the Substance, which has nothing changeable ». — In the text of Master (Peter) edition 1 for *from the Saints* [sanctis] reads *of the Holy Spirit* [Spiritus sancti], and editions 2, 3, 5, ,7 and 9 read *of the Holy One* [sancti]. A little after this codices A and C have *are* [sunt] for *shall be* [erunt].
[4] The Vatican edition and the other editions, contrary to editions 1 and 8 and codex D, faultily read *distinctly* [distincte].
[5] Distinction IX.
[6] On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. III, ch. 6. — The preceding proposition in regard to it sense and the other words have been taken from (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, Bk. VI, ch. 10, n. 12, and/or even ch. 8, n. 9.
[7] Chapter 1, n. 4.
[8] Number 1. — The text of Scripture is John 14:11.
[9] The Vatican edition, together with all the other

editions, reads *not intelligible*, with all the codices and the original contradicting this. Next the Vatican edition, together with the editions, except edition 1 and 8, and contrary to the original and the codices, reads *is possible for God* [Deo possibile est] .

---



natura rerum pati non posse aestimatur, id divinae veritatis ratio consequatur ». Patrem igitur in Filio et Filium in Patre esse, plenitudo in utroque divinitatis perfecta est »;[1] « quia plenitudo deitatis est in Filio. Quod in Patre est, hoc et in Filio est; quod in Ingenito est, hoc in Genito; alter ab altero et uterque unum »: « is scilicet qui est, nihil habens quod non sit etiam in eo, a quo est »;[2] « non duo unus, sed alius in alio, quia non aliud in utroque »; « ut unum in fide nostra sint uterque, non unus: nec eundem utrumque, nec aliud confitemur; quia Deum ex Deo natum nec eundem nativitas, nec aliud esse permittit ».[3] « Eandem igitur in utroque et virtutis similitudinem et deitatis plenitudinem confitemur, quia Veritas dicit: *Ego in Patre, et Pater in me est*. Omnia enim Filius accepit a Patre ».[4] « Nam si partem eiusdem, qui genuit, accepit, neuter ergo perfectus est: deest enim ei unde decessit, nec plenitudo in eo erit, qui ex portione constiterit. Neuter ergo perfectus est, si plenitudinem suam et qui genuit amittit, nec qui natus est consequitur ».[5] Fateamur ergo, quod Pater est in Filio et Filius in Patre, Deus in Deo », ut idem Hilarius ait in septimo libro de Trinitate,[6] « non per duplicem convenientium generum coniunctionem, nec per insitivam capacioris substantiae naturam, sed per naturae unitam similitudinem, per nativitatem viventis naturae ex vivente natura; dum res non differt, dum naturam Dei non degenerat nativitas, dum non aliud aliquid ex Deo quam Deus nascitur, dum nihil in his novum est, nihil alienum, nihil separabile ». Ecce his verbis, prout humana permittit infirmitas, intelligi potest,[7] ex quo sensu Christus dixerat, se esse in Patre et Patrem in se. Ex eodem etiam sensu intelligitur Spiritus sanctus esse in utroque et singula personarum in singulis; quia scilicet in singulis est eadem plenitudo divinitatis et unita similitudo naturae; quia non est maior

by the nature of the things be appraised not «able to suffer, that, the reckoning of divine truth attain [consequatur] ». « (Because) the Father, therefore, is in the Son and the Son in the Father, the fullness of the Divinity in Each is perfect »;[1] « because the fullness of the Deity is in the Son. What is in the Father, this also is in the Son; what is in the Unbegotten, this is in the Begotten; the One by the Other and Each the One »: « He, that is, who is, having nothing which is not also in the One, from whom He is »;[2] « not Two One, but the One in the Other, because non else in Each »; « as the One (Being) in our Faith are Each, not One (Person): we confess neither that Each is the Same (Person), nor Another; because the nativity permits that the God born out of God is neither the Same (Person as the Father), nor an Other (than Himself) ».[3] « Therefore we confess in Each the same similitude of virtue and fullness of Deity, because the Truth says: *I (am) in the Father and the Father is in Me*. For the Son accepted all «from the Father ».[4] « For if He accepted part of the Same, who begot (Him), therefore Neither is perfect: for it is lacking to Him whence He has departed [decesit], nor will there be a fullness in Him, who will have been established out of a portion. Therefore Neither is perfect, if both He who begot loses His own fullness, and He who has been born does not attain it ».[5] « Let us say [fateamur], therefore, that the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father, God in God », as the same (St.) Hilary says in the seventh book On the Trinity,[6] « not through a twofold conjunction of convening genera, nor through the engrafted nature of a more capable substance, but through the united similitude of nature, through the nativity of a living Nature out of a living Nature; while the thing does not differ, while the nativity does not degenerate the Nature of God, while not something out of God other than

divina natura in aliqua harum personarum, sed unius et indifferentis naturae sunt hae tres personae. Ideoque altera in altera esse dicitur, ut praedictum est. Unde Ambrosius[8] praedictorum verborum sententiam nobis aperiens super Epistolam secundam ad Corinthios quinto ait: « Per hoc intelligitur Pater esse in Filio et Filius in Patre, quia una est eorum substantia. Ibi enim est unitas, ubi nulla est[9] diversitas ». Ecce tribus illustrium virorum testimoniis, scilicet Augustini, Hilarii atque Ambrosii, in idem concurrentibus revelatione Spiritus sancti in eis loquentis pie credere volentibus ostenditur — tamen quasi *per speculum et in aenigmate*[10] — qualiter accipiendum sit, cum dicitur Pater in Filio esse vel Filius in Patre vel Spiritus sanctus in utroque.

God is born, while None among Them is new, nothing from elsewhere, nothing separable ». Behold by these words, insofar as human infirmity permits, there can be understood,[7] out of which sense Christ said, that He is in the Father and the Father in Him. Out of the same sense too is the Holy Spirit understood to be in Each and Each of the Persons in Each, because, namely, in Each there is the same fullness of the Divinity and the united similitude of nature; because there is not a greater Divine Nature in any of these Persons, but of the one and un-differing Nature are these Three Persons. And for that reason the One in the Other is said to be, as has been said beforehand. Whence Ambrose,[8] opening for us the sense [sententia] of the aforesaid words, says on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, in the fifth (chapter): « Through this the Father is understood to be in the Son and the Son in the Father, because one is Their Substance. For there is a unity, where there is[9] no diversity ». Behold by three testimonies of illustrious men, that is, of (Sts.) Augustine, Hilary and Ambrose, concurring in the same by the revelation of the Holy Spirit speaking in them, there is shown to those willing to believe in a pious manner — yet as *through a mirror and in an enigma*[10] — in what manner it must be accepted, when the Father is said to be in the Son and/or the Son in the Father and/or the Holy Spirit in Each.

## Pars. II.

Sed iam nunc ad propositum redeamus coeptoque insistamus ostendentes, quod magnitudine nulla trium pesonarum aliam superat, quia nulla maior aliis, nec maius aliquid sunt duae quam una, nec tres quam duae, nec maior Deus quam singuli eorum; quia singulus illorum perfectus est, nec est quo crescat illa perfectio.[11]

## Part II

But now presently let us return to the proposed, and having begun let us set out, showing, that in magnitude None of the Three Persons surpasses the Other, because None (is) greater than the Others, nor are Two something greater than One, nor Three than Two, nor a God greater than Each of Them; because Each One of Them is perfect, nor is there (anything) whereby that perfection grows.[11]

### Cap. V.

*Quod nulla personarum pars est in Trinitate.*

Nec est aliqua trium personarum pars Dei

### Chapter V

*That None of the Persons is a part in the Trinity.*

Nor is Any of the Three Persons a part of

vel divinae essentiae, quia singula harum verus et plenus Deus est et tota et plena divina essentia est; et ideo nulla istarum in Trinitate pars est. Unde Augustinus in libro secundo contra Maximinum[12] haereticum sic ait: « Putas, Deum Patrem cum Filio et Spiritu sancto unum Deum esse non posse; times enim, ne Pater sit pars unius Dei, qui constet ex tribus. Noli hoc timere, nulla enim fit partium in deitatis unitate divisio. Unus est Deus Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, id est ipsa Trinitas unus est Deus. Ergo, inquis, Deus Pater est pars Dei; absit ».

God and/or of the Divine Essence, because Each of Them is the true and full God and is both the whole and full Divine Essence; and for that reason None of Them is a part in the Trinity. Whence (St.) Augustine in the second book Against Maximinus the Heretic,[12] speaks thus: « Do you think, that God the Father cannot be the One God with the Son and the Holy Spirit; for you fear, that the Father may be a part of the One God, who is constituted out of Three. Do not fear this, for no division of parts comes to be in the unity of the Deity. One God is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, that is the Trinity Itself is the One God. Therefore, you ask, "Is God the Father a part of God?"; far be it ».

## Cap. VI.

*Quare tres personae dicantur summe unum*.

« Tres enim personae sunt Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, et hi tres, quia unius substantiae sunt, . . .

## Chapter VI

*For what reason are the Three Persons said to be most highly one*.

« For there are Three Persons, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and these Three, because They are of the one Substance, . . .

---

[1] Ibid. n. 23; et quod sequitur n. 4; in quo textu Vat. et aliae edd. contra codd. et originale legunt *divinitatis* pro *deitatis*.
[2] Ibid. n. 23, et deinde n. 4; in quo textu cod. C post *non duo* adiicit *sunt*.
[3] Libr. I. n. 47.
[4] Libr. III. n. 23. — Locus Scripturae est Ioan. 14, 11.
[5] Libr. III. n. 8, in quo circa initium Vat. cum paucis edd. *deesset* pro *deest*, et paulo infra post *neuter ergo* edd. 1, 8 addunt *eorum*.
[6] Num. 39; sed verba: per naturae unitam similitudinem, sumta sunt ex n. 37. — In textu Vat. cum aliis edd. contra 1, 8 et codd. post *in Patre* addit *et*. Deinde Vat. et edd. 4, 6, 9 male legunt *insitam* pro *insitivam*. Denique post *viventis* auctoritate codd. A B E et edd. 1, 8 adiecimus *naturae*. Hilarius: viventis ex vivente naturae.
[7] Vat. et aliae edd., exceptis 1, 8 *aperitur* pro *intelligi potest* contra omnes codd.
[8] Vel potius *Ambrosiater*, ut communiter citatur, qui, teste Augustino, est quidam *Hilarius*, non Pictaviensis, sed quidam diaconus Romanus, ut videtur, auctor Commentarii in XII Epistolas beati Pauli (in appendice Operum Ambrosii). Contra eundem S. Hieronymus in Dialogo seu altercatione contra Luciferianos n. 25. scripsisse fertur. — Locus Apostoli ab ipso explicatus est II. Cor. 5, 19. — Ante vocem *Ambrosius* edd. 1, 8 bene addunt *etiam*.
[9] Vat. ed aliae edd., excepta 5, omittunt *est* contra omnes codd. et originale.
[10] I. Cor. 13, 12. — Paulo supra ante *concurrentibus* sola Vat. male legit *in eodem* pro *in idem*.

---

[1] Ibid., n. 23; and what follows is n. 4; in which text the Vatican edition and the other editions, contrary to the codices and to the original, read *of the Divinity* [divinitatis] for *of the Deity* [deitatis].
[2] Ibid., n. 23, and then n. 4; in which text codex C after *not Two* [non duo] inserts *are* [sunt].
[3] Book I, n. 47.
[4] Book III, n. 23. — The text of Scripture is Jn. 14:11.
[5] Book III, n. 8, in which near the beginning the Vatican edition, together with a few editions, reads *it would be lacking* [deesset] for *it is lacking* [deest], and a little below this after *Therefore Neither* [neuter ergo] add *of Them* [eorum].
[6] Number 39; but the words: *through the united similitude of the Nature* [per naturae unitam similtudinem], have been taken from n. 37. — In the text the Vatican edition together with the other editions, contray to editions 1 and 8 and the codices, after *in the Father* [in Patre] add *and* [et]. Then the Vatican edition and editions 4, 6, and 9, badly read *implanted* [insitam] for *engrafted* [insitivam]. Then after *the nativity of a living* [nativitatem viventis], on the authority of codices A B and E and editions 1 and 8, we have inserted *Nature* [naturae]. (St.) Hilary writes: *the nativity of a living Nature out of a Living One* [nativitatem viventis ex vivente naturae].
[7] The Vatican edition and the other editions, except editions 1 and 8, has *there is revealed* [aperitur] for *there can be understood* [intelligi potest], contrary to all the codices.
[8] And/or rather *Ambrosiater*, as he is commonly cited, who, according to the testimony of (St.)

[11] Praecedentia quoad sensum et aliqua verba sumta sunt ex August. libr. VI. de Trint. c. 8. n. 9, et c. 10. n. 12. — Vat. cum pluribus edd. post *singuli* et *singulus* habet bis *horum* loco *eorum* et *illorum*.
[12] Cap. 10. n. 1, et duo sequentes loci ibid. n. 2.

Augustine, is a certain *Hilary*, not of Poitiers, but a certain Roman Deacon, as it seems, the author of the Commentary on the 12 Epistles of Blessed Paul (in the appendix of the Works of St. Ambrose). It is said that St. Jerome wrote against the same in his Dialogue or Altercation against the Luciferians, n. 25. — The passage from the Apostle explained by him is 2 Cor. 5:19. — Before the word *Ambrose* [Ambrosius] editions 1 and 8 rightly add *even* [etiam].
[9] The Vatican edition and the other editions, except edition 5, omit *there is* [est], contrary to all the codices and the original.
[10] 1 Cor. 13:12. — A little above this only the Vatican edition badly reads *in the same* [in eodem] for *in the same (word)* [idem].
[11] The preceding, in regard to its sense, and the other words, have been taken from (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, Bk. VI, ch. 8, n. 9, and ch. 19, n. 12. — The Vatican edition, together with very many editions, after *Each* [singuli] and *Each One* [singulus], twice have *of These* [horum] in place of *of Them* [eorum and illourm, respectively].
[12] Chapter 10, n. 1, and the two following passages, ibid., n. 2.

---

***p. 338***

unum sunt et summe unum sunt, ubi nulla naturarum, nulla est diversitas voluntatum. Si enim *natura* unum essent, et *consensione*[1] non essent, non *summe* unum essent; si vero *natura* dispares essent, unum non essent. Hi ergo tres, quia[2] unum sunt propter ineffabilem coniunctionem Deitatis, qua ineffabiliter copulantur, unus Deus est ». « Pars ergo Trinitatis esse non potest quicumque unus[3] in tribus. In Trinitate igitur, quae Deus est, et Pater Deus est, et Filius Deus est, et Spiritus sanctus Deus est, et simul hi tres unus Deus; nec huius Trinitatis tertia pars est una, nec maius aliquid duo quam unus est ibi, nec maius aliquid sunt omnes quam singuli, quia spiritualis, non corporalis est magnitudo. *Qui potest capere, capiat*;[4] qui atuem non potest, credat et oret, ut quod credit intelligat. Verum est enim quod dicitur per Prophetam:[5] *Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis* ». His verbis aperte ostendit indifferentem magnitudinem trium personarum. Item in eodem:[6] « Tu nempe dixisti, unum Deum non ex partibus esse compositum; et hoc de Patre tantum vis intelligi. Ille, inquis, virtus est ingenita, simplex. Et tamen in hac simplici virtute multa videris commemorare, cum dicis:

are the One and are most highly One, where there is no diversity of natures, none of wills. For if They were one *by Nature*, and were not[1] *in agreement*, They would not be *most highly* One; but if They were disparate *by Nature*, They would not be One. These Three, therefore, because[2] They are One on account of the ineffable conjunction of the Deity, by which They are ineffably joined, the One God is ». « Therefore, part of the Trinity cannot be any One[3] whosoever among the Three. Therefore, in the Trinity, which God is, both the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and these three together the One God; neither is a third part of this Trinity One (Person), nor is Two something more than One there, nor are All something more than Each, because (Their) magnitude is spiritual, not corporal. *Who can grasp it, let him grasp it*;[4] but who cannot, let him believe and pray, to understand what he believes. For what is said through the Prophet is true:[5] *Unless you will have believed, you will not understand* ». With these words he openly shows the un-differing magnitude of the Three Persons. Likewise in the same (chapter he says):[6] « You, namely, have said, that the One God has not been

Deus Deum genuit, bonus bonum genuit, sapiens sapientem, clemens clementem, potens potentem. Nunquid ergo bonitas et sapientia et clementia et potentia partes sunt unius virtutis, quam simplicem esse dixisti? Si dixeris, partes sunt: simplex ergo virtus ex partibus constat. Et simplex ista virtus, te definiente, unus est Deus: ergo Deum ex partibus compositum esse dicis. Non dico, inquis, non sunt ergo[7] partes. Si ergo in una persona Patris et illa invenis quae plura videntur, et partes non invenis, quia una virtus simplex est: quanto magis Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus et propter individuam deitatem unus Deus est et propter uniuscuiusque proprietatem tres personae sunt et propter singulorum perfectionem partes unius Dei non sunt! Virtus est Pater, virtus est Filius, virtus est Spiritus sanctus. Hoc verum dicis; sed quod virtutem de virtute genitam et virtutem de virtute procedentem non vis eandem habere naturam, hoc falsum dicis, hoc contra fidem rectam et catholicam dicis ». His verbis aperte docetur, quod tres illae pesonae non sunt partes Dei vel divinae essentiae, nullaque illarum[8] Trinitatis pars dicenda est nec una maior aliis.

composed out of parts, and you want that this be understood of the Father only. He, you say, is the unbegotten, simple, Virtue. And yet in this simple Virtue, you will see many things called to mind [multa commemorare], when you say: 'God begot God, the Good One begot the Good, the Wise the Wise, the Clement the Clement, the Powerful One the Powerful. Therefore are Goodness and Wisdom and Clemency and Power part of the one Virtue, which you have said is simple? If you will say, they are parts: therefore the simple virtue is established out of parts. And that simple Virtue of yours, by your definition, is the One God: therefore you say that God has been composed out of parts. I do not say it, you say it, there are, therefore,[7] no parts. If, therefore, in the one Person of the Father you both find those which seem many, and you do not find parts, because the one Virtue is simple: how much more the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit both on account of the undivided Deity is the One God and on account of the property of each One are Three Persons and on account of the perfection of Each are not parts of the One God! The Virtue is the Father, the Virtue is the Son, the Virtue is the Holy Spirit. In this you speak the truth; but because you do not want that the virtue begotten from the Virtue, and the virtue proceeding form the Virtue to have the same Nature, in this you speak a falsehood, in this you speak against the right and Catholic Faith ». With these words there is openly taught, that those Three Persons are not parts of God and/or of the Divine Essence, and that None of Those[8] is to be said (to be) a part of the Trinity nor One greater than the Others.

## Cap. VII.

*Cum dicimus, tres personas esse unam essentiam, nec ut genus de speciebus nec ut speciem de individuis praedicamus, quia non est essentia genus et persona species, vel essentia species et personae individua.*

Hic adiiciendum est, quod tanta est aequalitas trium personarum atque indifferens magnitudo, quod cum dicamus,

## Chapter VII

*When we say, that the Three Persons are the one Essence, neither do we predicate It as a genus of species nor as a species of individuals, because it is not (that) the Essence is a genus and a Person a species, and/or the Essence a species and the Persons individuals.*

Here there must be inserted, that so great is the equality of the Three Persons and indifferent the magnitude, that when we

tres personas unam esse[9] essentiam vel substantiam, neque ut genus de speciebus, neque ut speciem de individuis praedicamus. Non enim essentia divina genus est et tres pesonae species, vel essentiae divina species et tres personae individua. Quod Augustinus rationibus probabilibus atque irrefragabilibus aperte demonastrat in libro septimo de Trinitate[10] ita dicens: « Si essentia genus est, species autem persona, ut nonnulli sentiunt, oportet appellari tres substantias, ut appellantur tres personae; sicut cum sit animal genus et equus species, appelantur tres equi, iidemque tria animali. Non enim species ibi pluraliter dicitur et genus singulariter, ut si diceretur, tres equi sunt unum animal; sed sicut tres equi speciali nomine, ita tria animalia generali nomine dicuntur ». Cum ergo tres personas unam fateamur esse essentiam, non tres essentias, cum tres[11] equi tria animali dicantur, non unum: patet, nomine essentiae non significari genus nec nomine personae speciem.

say, that the Three Persons are[9] the one Essence and/or Substance, neither do we predicate (Them) as a genus of species, nor as a species of individuals. For the Divine Essence is not a genus and the Three Persons species, and/or the Divine Essence a species and the Three Persons individuals. Which (St.) Augustine openly demonstrates with probable and irrefragable reasons in the seventh book On the Trinity,[10] saying thus: « If the Essence is the genus, but a Person the species, as not a few think [sentiunt], one is bound to name the Three substances, as They are named Three Persons; just as since “animal” is a genus and “horse” a species, they are named three “horses”, and the same three “animals”. For There are not said to be species in the plural and a genus in the singular, as if there would be said, ‘three horses are one animal’; but just as they are said (to be) three “horses” by the name of a species, so three “animals” by the name of a genus ». Therefore since we say that the Three Persons are the one Essence, not Three essences, since three horses are said (to be)[11] three animals, not one: it is clear, that by the name “essence” a genus is not signified, nor by the name “person” a species.

« Si vero dicunt, nomine personae non speciem significari, sed aliquid singulare atque individuum, et nomine essentiae speciem intelligi, ut persona non dicatur sicut *homo*, sed quomodo dicitur *hic homo*, velut Abraham, Isaac et Iacob vel quis alius, qui etiam digito praesens demonstrari possit; sic quoque illos eadem ratio confutabit. Sicut enim dicuuntur Abraham, Isaac et Iacob tria individua, ita tres homines et tria animalia. Cur ergo Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, si secundum genus et speciem et individuum ista disserimus, non ita dicuntur tres essentiae, ut tres personae »?[12]

« On the other hand, if they say, that by the name “person” a species is not signified, but something singular and individual (is), and by the name “essence” there is understood a species, as a person id not said just as “*man*” is said, but the manner “*this man*” is said, just as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and/or anyone else, who could also be demonstrated to be present by a finger, so also shall the same reckoning confute them. For just as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are said (to be) three individuals, so three men and three animals. Why, therefore, are the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, if we discuss Them according to genus and species and individual, not thus said (to be) three essences, as (They are) Three Persons »?[12]

Alio quoque modo idem probat Augustinus, scilicet quod essentia divina non est genus, nec personae species, vel essentia non est species nec personae . . .

In another manner, (St.) Augustine also proves teh same, that is, that the Divine Essence is not a genus, nor the Persons species, and/or (that) the Essence is not a species nor the Persons . . .

[1] Vat. et edd. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 addunt *unum*, contradicentibus aliis edd., codd. et originali. Paulo post cum originali, codd. et ed. 1 expunximus *summe* ante *non essent*.
[2] Edd. 1, 6, 8 et orginale *qui*.
[3] Vat. et alia edd., exceptis 1, 6, addunt *est* contra codd. et originale.
[4] Matth. 19, 12.
[5] Isai. 7, 9. iuxta lectionem Septuag. et Augustini. Vulgata. *Si non credideritis, non permanebitis*.
[6] Ibid. n. 3.
[7] Vat. et plures edd. omittunt *ergo* contra originale codd. et edd. 1, 6. Mox Vat. et edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 *non inveneris* loco *non invenis*.
[8] Codd. B C D E *earum*, cod. A *harum*. Deinde in fine ante *aliis* solummodo Vat. et edd. 4, 9 non bene addunt *est*.
[9] Vat. et ed. 4 omittunt *esse*.
[10] Cap. 6. n. 11. — Vat. contra edd. 1, 8 et codd. omittit *ita* ante *dicens*. Verba vero Augustini sic leguntur in originali: « Nam si genus est essentia, species autem substantia sive persona, ut nonnulli sentiunt, omitto illud quod iam dixi, oportere appellari tres essentias, ut appellantur tres substantiae vel personae, sicut appellantur tres equi, eademque animalia tria, cum sit species equus, animal genus. Neque enim species ibi pluraliter dicta est et genus singulariter, tanquam diceretur tres equi, unum animal; sed sicut tres equi speciali nomine, ita tria animalia generali nomine ».
[11] Vat. et edd. 4, 8, 9 hic male adiiciunt *esse*.
[12] Loc. cit. immediate post; in quo textu Vat. et plures edd. bis omittunt *et* post *Isaac*.

[1] The Vatican edition and editions 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 add *one* [unum], with the other editions, codices and the original contradicting this. Similarly, together with the original, the codices and edition 1, we have expunged *most highly* [summe] from this clause, which otherwise would read *and were not most highly in agreement* [et consensione summe non essent].
[2] Editions 1, 6, and 8 and the original read *who* [qui] for *because They* [quia].
[3] The Vatican edition and the other editions, except edition 1 and 6, read *whosoever is among the Three* [quicumque unus est in tribus] for *whosoever among the Three* [quicumque unus in tribus], contrary to the codices and the original.
[4] Mt. 19:12.
[5] Isaiah 7:9, according to the Septuagint and (St.) Augustine. The Vulgate reads: *If you will not have believed, you shall not remain* [Si non credideritis, non permanebitis].
[6] Ibid., n .3.
[7] The Vatican edition and very many editions omit *therefore* [ergo], contrary to the original, to the codices and to editions 1 and 6. Next the Vatican edition and editions 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9, read *you will not have found* [non inveneris] for *you do not find* [non invenis].
[8] Codices B C D and E have *of Them* [earum], codex A has *of These* [harum]. then at the end before *One* [aliis] only the Vatican edition and editions 4 and 9, add not so well *is* [est].
[9] The Vatican edition and edition 4 omit *are* [esse].
[10] Chapter 6, n. 11. — The Vatican edition, contrary to editions 1 and 8 and the codices, omits *thus* [ita]. But the words of (St.) Augustine are read in the original in this manner: « For if the genus is the Essence, but the species the Substance or Person, as not a few think, I omit that which I have already said, that one is bound to name the Three essences, as the Three are named substances and/or Persons, just as there are said (to be) three horses and the same three animals, since the species is “horse”, “animal” the genus. For neither has species been said there in the plural and genus in the singular, as if three horses were said (to be) one animal; but just as (there is said to be) three “horses” by the name of a species, so three “animas” by the name of a genus ».
[11] The Vatican edition and editions 4, 8 and 9, here badly add *to be* [esse, which however is required in English when *dicere* is rendered as *to say*].
[12] Loc. cit., immediately after this; in which text the Vatican edition and very many editions twice omit *and* [et] after *Isaac* [Iasaac].

---



individua. « Una, inquit,[1] essentia non habet species, sicut unum animal non habet species unius essentiae. Pater ergo et Filius et Spiritus sanctus non sunt tres species unius essentiae: divina ergo essentia genus

individuals. « The one Essence », he says,[1] « has no species, just as one animal does not have a species of one essence. Therefore the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are not three species of the one

non est. Sed nec species est essentia divina et personae individua, sicut homo species est, individua autem Abraham, Isaac et Iacob. Si enim essentia species est, ut homo, sicut unus homo non dicitur esse Abraham, Isaac et Iacob, ita non dicetur[2] una essentia esse tres personae. Non itaque secundum genus et species ista dicimus ».

Essence: therefore the Divine Essence is not a genus. but neither is the Divine Essence a species and the Persons individuals, just as "man" is a species, but Abraham, Isaac, and Jacobs individuals. For if the Essence is a species, as (is) "man", just as one man is not said to be Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, thus the one Essence will not be said[2] to be the Three Persons. And so not according to genus and species do we say These ».

### Cap. VIII.

*Quod nec secundum materialem causam dicuntur tres personae una essentia.*

Notandum etiam, quod essentia divina non est materia trium personarum, ut Augustinus in eodem libro[3] docet, « tanquam secundum communem eandemque materiam tres personae dicantur esse una essentia, sicut ex eodem auro si fierent tres statuae, diceremus tres statuas unum aurum. Non autem sic Trinitatem, id est tres personas, dicimus unam essentiam et unum Deum, tanquam ex una materia tria quaedam subsistant. In statuis enim aequalibus plus auri est tres simul quam singulae, et minus auri est una quam duae. In illa vero essentia Trinitatis nullo modo ita est ». Non ergo secundum materialem causam tres personas unam dicimus esse[4] essentiam, sicut tres statuae dicuntur unum aurum.

### Chapter VIII

*That neither according to a material cause are the Three Persons said to be the one Essence.*

It must also be noted, that the Divine Essence is not the matter of the Three Persons, as (St.) Augustine teaches in the same book,[3] « just as if according to a common and same matter the Three Persons were said to be the one Essence, as if there statues were made out of the same gold, we would say that the three statues (are) the one piece of gold [unum aurum]. But not in this manner do we say that the Trinity, that is the Three Persons, (are) the one Essence and the One God, as if a certain Three subsist out of one matter. For in equal statutes three is more gold than each, and one is less gold than two. But in that Essence of the Trinity it is in no manner thus ». Not, therefore, according to a material cause do we say that the Three Persons are[4] the one Essence, just as three statues are said (to be) the one piece of gold.

### Cap. IX.

*Nec ita dicuntur tres personae una essentia, ut tres homines una natura vel unius naturae.*

His quoque addendum est, quod tres personas non ita dicimus esse unam essentiam, ut Augustinus in eodem[5] ait, vel unius essentiae, « sicut dicimus, aliquos tres homines eiusdem sexus et eiusdem temperationis corporis eiusdemque animi unam esse naturam vel unius naturae. Nam in his rebus non tantum est unus homo, quantum tres homines simul, et plus aliquid sunt homines duo quam unus homo, sicut et in statuis esse diximus; at in Deo non est

### Chapter IX

*Nor are the Three Persons thus said to be the one Essence, as three men (are) one in nature and/or of one nature.*

To these too must be added, that we do not thus say that the Three Persons are the one Essence, as (St.) Augustine says in the same (book),[5] and/or (are) of the one Essence, « just as we say, that any three men of the same sex and of the same self-control [temperationis] of the body and of the same spirit [animi] are one nature and/or of one nature. For among these things one man is not as much, as three men (are) together, and two men are something more than one

ita. Non enim maior essentia est Pater et Filius quam solus Pater vel solus Filius, sed tres simul illae personae aequales sunt singulis ». Ex praemissis patet, quod tres personae dicuntur divina essentia nec secundum materialem causam, ut tres statuae unum aurum, nec secundum complexionis similitudinem, ut tres homines unius naturae, nec ut genus praedicatur de speciebus, vel ut species de individuis, id est continens de contentis, maius de minoribus.

man, just as we have said is also among statues; but in God it is not so. For not greater in Essence is the Father and the Son than the Father alone and/or the Son alone, but those Three Persons together are equal to Each ». From the aforementioned it is clear, that the Three Persons are said (to be) the Divine Essence neither according to a material cause, as three statues (are said to be) the one piece of gold, nor according to a similitude of complexion, as three men (are said to be) of one nature, nor as a genus is predicated of species, and/or a species of individuals, that is as one containing of the contained, more of the less.

His autem videtur adversari quae quidam sacrae Scripturae tractatores catholici in suis scriptis tradiderunt, in quibus significare videntur, quod essentia divina sit quoddam[6] commune et universale, velut species; tres vero personae sint tria particularia, tria individua numero differentia. Unde Ioannes Damascenus, inter Doctores Graecorum magnus, in libro, quem de Trinitate scripsit,[7] quem et papa Eugenius transferri facit, ait: « Communia et universalia praedicantur de subiectis sibi ipsis particularibus. Commune ergo substantia est, particulare vero hypostasis, id est persona. Particulare autem dicitur, non quod partem naturae habet, sed particulare numero, ut atomus, id est individuum. Numero enim et[8] non natura differre dicuntur hypostases ». Item in eodem:[9] « Substantia significat communem et circumplectivam speciem homoideon, id est similium specie hypostaseon, id est personarum, ut puta Deus, homo; hypostasis autem individuum demonstrat, id est Patrem, Filium et Spiritum sanctum, Petrum, Paulum et huiusmodi ». Ecce aperte dicit, substantiam esse univeralem, hypostasim vero particulare, et quod Deus est species, ut homo, et quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus sunt individua, sicut Petrus et Paulus, eo quod numero differunt; quae praemissae sententiae Augsutini penitus contradicere videntur. Quid ergo dicemus ad haec? Hoc utique dicere possumus atque debemus, quod ea quae Augustinus tradidit superius, sine omni haesitatione tenenda sunt.

On the one hand, to these seem to be opposed (those), which certain Catholic commentators [tractatores] on Sacred Scripture, in their own writings, handed down, among which seem to signify, that the Divine Essence is a certain[6] common and universal, just as a species; on the other hand, (they seem to signify that) the Three Persons are three particulars, three individuals differing in number. Whence (St.) John Damascene, great among the Doctors of the Greeks, in the book, which he wrote on the Trinity,[7] which Pope Eugenius also caused to be translated, says: « Common and universal (names) are predicated of subjects particular to themselves. Therefore common is the Substance, but particular a Hypostasis, that is a Person. Moreover there is said “particular”, not because it has part of the nature, but (because it is) particular in number, as an atom, that is an individual. For in number and[8] not by Nature are the Hypostases said to differ ». Likewise in the same:[9] « “Substance” signifies the common and encompassing [circumplectivam] species of homoides, that is of hypostases similar in species, that is persons, as for example “God”, “man”; but a “hypostasis” demonstrates an individual, that is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, Peter, Paul and (individuals) of this kind ». Behold he openly says, that a “substance” is universal, but a “hypostasis” particular, and that “God” is a species, as “man”, and that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are individuals, just as Peter and Paul, for this that They differ in number; which

Haec autem, quae hic dicuntur, licet in sermonis superficie aliquid a fide alienum resonare videantur, sane tamen intelligi queunt piumque lectorem atque . . .

seems to entirely contradict the aforementioned sentence of (St.) Augustine. What, therefore, shall we say to this? This, indeed, we can and ought to say, that those which (St.) Augustine handed down above, without any [omni] hesitation are to be held. But, these (words), which are here said, though they seem on the surface [superficie] of discourse to resonate something alien from the Faith, yet they can be sanely understood and do earnestly demand a most pious reader and . . .

---

[1] Loc. cit. parum infra; sed ultimas propositiones Magister contraxit ex diffusiore Augustini doctrina. — Mox auctoritate omnium codd. et ed. 1 inseriumus *unius essentiae* post *animal non habet species*. Deinde solummodo Vat. et ed. 8 post *Pater ergo* omittunt *et*.
[2] Vat. cum pluribus edd. contra edd. 1, 3, 7, 8 et codd. B C E *dicitur*; codd. A D bene *diceretur*. In fine codd. C D *dicuntur* pro *dicimus*.
[3] Loc. cit. immediate post.
[4] Vat. et aliae edd., excepta 1, contra omnes codd. adiiciunt *substantiam vel*.
[5] Cap. 6. n. 11. — Prima propositio iam paulo ante relata est. In textu Vat. cum pluribus edd. contra edd. 1, 6, 8, codd. et originale omittit *et* ante *in statuis*.
[6] Cod. D cum Vat. et edd. 3, 4, 6, 8 *quiddam*. Paulo ante post *adversari* codd. A C non male addunt *ea*.
[7] Libr. III. de Fide orthodoxa c. 6, secundum versionem a Burgundione Pisamo iussu Eugenii III. factam et a Ioanne Conon valde impugnatam, qua tamen antiqui Shcolastici saec. 13 post Lombardum utebantur. Teste Fabricio (Bilioth. Graec. tom. 9.) nunquam typis impressa est. Subiicimus Damasceni verba iuxta versionem Mich. Lequien Od. Praed. (ed. Migne Patrolog. Graec. tom. 94.): « Quae communia et universalia sunt de particularibus sibi subiectis praedicantur. Commune porro quoddam est essentia, ut species; particulare persona. Particulare, inquam, non quod naturae partem quandam sibi vindicet, sed quia numero particulare est, ut individuum. Personae siquidem non natura, sed numero inter se distingui dicuntur ». — Vat. contra ed. 1 et codd. legit *Graecorum maximus* loco *Graecorum magnus*.
[8] Vat. et edd. 4, 6 omittunt *et*, et immediate post contra originale, codd. et edd. 1, 6, 8 Vat. cum aliis edd. *videntur* loco *dicuntur*.
[9] Cap. 4. — Ed. Migne: « Quod porro aliud sit substantia et aliud hypostatis, multoties a nobis dictum est, quodque substantia sive essentia communem speciem eiusdemque speciei personas (□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□) complectentem significet, ut Deus, homo; persona autem ac hypostasis individuum denotet, puta Patrem, Filium et Spiritum sanctum, Petrum, Paulum ».

---

[1] Loc. cit., a little below; but Master (Peter) contracted the final sentences from the more lengthy doctrine of (St.) Augustine. — Next on the authority of all the codices and edition 1, we have inserted *of one essence* after *animal does not have a species* [animal non habet species]. Then only the Vatican edition and edition 8 after *Therefore, the Father* [Pater ergo] omit *and* [et].
[2] The Vatican edition, together with very many editions, contrary to editions 1, 3, 7 and 8, and codices B C and E, has *is not said* [non dicitur], codices A and D have well *would not be said* [non diceretur]. At the end, codices C and D have *are These said* [ista dicuntur] for *do we say These* [ista dicimus].
[3] Loc. cit., immediately after this.
[4] The Vatican edition and the other editions, except edition 1, contrary to all the codices, inserts *the Substance and/or* [substantiam vel].
[5] Chapter 6, n. 11. — The first proposition has already been related a little before this. In the quote, the Vatican edition together with very many editions, contrary to editions 1, 6 and 8, the codices, and to the original, omits *also* [et] before *among statues* [in statuis].
[6] Codex D, together with the Vatican edition, and editions 3, 4, 6, and 8, reads *a certain something* [quiddam] for *a certain* [quoddam]. A little before this after *to be opposed* [adversari] codices A and C do not badly add *those* [ea].
[7] On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. III, ch. 6, according to the version by the Burgundian Pisamus, executed by order of Pope Eugene III, and greatly impugned by John Conon, which, however, after Lombard, was used by the ancient Scholastics of the 13th Century. According to the testimony of Fabricius (Biblioth. Graec., tome 9), it was never published in typeface. We offer the words of (St. John) Damascene according to the version of Friar Michael Lequien, O. P., (Migne's, Patrologia Graeca., tome 94): « Those which are common and universal are predicated of particulars subject to themselves. Furthermore, a common, certain something is an essence, as a species; a particular, a person. I say a particular, not because it claims for itself a certain part of a nature, but because it is particular in number, as an individual. Persons, if indeed not by nature, but in number are said to be distinguished among themselves ». — The Vatican edition, contrary to

edition 1 and the codices, reads *the greatest* [maximus] in place of *great* [magnus].

[8] The Vatican edition and editions 4 and 6, omit *and* [et], and immediately after this, contrary to the original, to the codices and to editions 1, 6, and 8, the Vatican edition, together with some editions, has *do . . . seem to differ* [differre videntur] in place of *are . . . said to differ* [differre dicuntur].

[9] Chapter 4. — In the edition of Migne: « Furthermore, that one is a substance and another a hypostasis, has be said by us many times, and that the “substance” or “essence” signifies the common species comprising also the persons of the same species (□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□), as “God”, “man”; but “person” and “hypostasis” denotes an individual, as for example the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, Peter, Paul ».

---



intellectorem plurimum efflagitant. In quorum explanatione mallem silens alios audire, quam loquendo malevolis detrahendi occasionem praestare. Videtur[1] tamen mihi ita posse accipi. Cum ait: substantia est commune, et hypostatis est particulare, non ita haec accepit, cum de Deo dicantur, ut accipiuntur in philosophica disciplina, sed per similitudinem eorum quae a philosophis dicuntur, locutus est; ut sicut ibi *commune* vel universale dicitur quod praedicatur de pluribus, *particulare* vero vel individuum quod de uno solo; ita hic[2] essentia divina dicta est *universale*, quia de omnibus personis simul et de singulis separatim dicitur, quia nec de aliis communiter nec de aliqua aliarum singulariter praedicatur. Propter similitudinem ergo praedicationis substantiam Dei[3] dixit *universlae*, et personae *particularia* vel individua. Propter hoc idem etiam eandem divinam essentiam dixit esse « speciem communem et circumplectivam similium speciei personarum », quia sicut haec species *homo* de suis praedicatur individuis, velut de Petro, Paulo et aliis, nec isti specie differunt, sed conveniunt,[4] ita *Deus* de tribus praedicatur personis, quae in divinitate non differunt, sed per omnia conveniunt. Hanc ergo similitudinem inter res sempiternas et res temporales perpendens Ioannes universalitatis et particularitatis nomine, quae rebus temporalibus proprie conveniunt, ad res aeternas transtulit;

understander. In the explanation of which I prefer, as one silent, to hear others, than by speaking offer occasion to the malevolent for detracting (them). However, it seems[1] to me that (they) can be accepted thus. When there is said: ‘a substance is common, and a hypostasis is particular’, he did not accept these (words), when they are said of God, as they are accepted in the philosophical discipline, but they have been spoken through a similitude to those things which are said by philosophers; as just as there, that which is predicated of many is said (to be) *common* and/or *universal*, but what is (said) of one alone (is said to be) *particular* and/ individual; thus here[2] the Divine Essence has been said (to be) *universal*, because of all the Persons together and of Each separately It is said, because neither is It predicated of the Others commonly nor of Anyone of the Others singularly. On account of a similitude, therefore, of predication he said that the Substance of God[3] (is) *universal*, and the Persons *particular* and/or individual. On this account the same also said that the same Divine Essence is « a species common and encompassing of Persons similar in species », because just as this species “*man*” is predicated of its own individuals, as of Peter, Paul and others, neither do they differ in species, but (rather) agree [conveniunt];[4] thus “*God*” is predicated of the Three Persons, who do not differ in Divinity, but agree in all things [per omnia].

Augustinus vero, maiorem videns dissimilitudinem quam similitudinem inter res praedictas, ab excellentia Trinitatis praedicta nomina removit.

Weighing carefully, therefore, this similitude among things sempiternal and things temporal, (St.) John transferred it, in the name of universality and particularity, which properly convenes with temporal things, to eternal things; but (St.) Augustine, seeing a greater dissimilarity, than similarity among the aforementioned things, removed the aforesaid names from the excellence of the Trinity.

## Cap. X.

*Utrum tres personae differant numero, quae proprietatibus distinctae sunt.*

Quod autem Ioannes dicit, hypostases differre numero, non natura, in eo quod non differre natura ait, verissime et sine scrupulo loquitur; quod vero dicit, differre numero, cavendum est, quomodo intelligatur; diversis enim modis dicuntur aliqua differre numero.

Dicuntur enim aliqua differre numero, quando ita differunt, ut hoc non sit illud nec aliquid, quod illud est vel in ipso est: qualiter differunt Socrates et Plato et huiusmodi, quae apud philosophos dicuntur individua vel particularia; iuxta quem modum non possunt dici tres personae differre numero. Dicuntur quoque differre numero quae in enumeratione sive computatione non sibi adiunguntur, sed a se inviem discernuntur, ut cum de aliquibus rebus loquentes dicimus *una, duae, tres,* et secundum hunc modum forte dixit Ioannes *hypostates*, id est personas, differre numero. Possumus enim dicere: Pater est unus, et Pater et Filius sunt duo, et Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus sunt tres; et item: haec persona est una, et haec et illa sunt duae, et haec et illa et alia sunt tres. Convenientius tamen tres illae personae proprietatibus tantum distingui dicuntur, de quarum distinctione secundum proprietates in sequenti tractabitur.[5] Nunc vero ad inceptum redeamus, quae dicta sunt repetentes, ut saepius versando familiarius innotescant.

## Chapter X

*Whether the Three Persons differ in number, who have been distinguished by properties*.

On the one hand, what (St.) John (Damascene) says, that the Hypostases differ in number, not in nature, in this that he says that They do not differ in nature, he speaks very truly and without scruple; on the other hand, what he says, that They differ in number, one must beware, in what manner it be understood; for in diverse ways are somethings said to differ in number.

For some are said to differ in number, when they so differ, that this is not that nor something, which that is and/or is in that: in this manner Socrates and Plato differ, and (things) of this kind, which among philosophers are said (to be) individuals and/or particulars; according to which manner there cannot be said that the Three Persons differ in number. Also, those are said to differ in number, which are not added [adiunguntur] to themselves in enumeration or computation, but are discerned by themselves, as when speaking of some things we say "*one, two, three*," and according to this manner perhaps did (St.) John say, that *the Hypostasis*, that is the Persons, differ in number. For we can say: 'the Father is one, the Father and the Son are two, and the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are three'; and likewise: 'this person is one, this and that are two, this and that and the other are three'. However, more fittingly are those Three Persons said to be distinguished by properties only, concerning the distinction of which according to properties there will be treatment in a following (distinction).[5] But now let us return to the undertaking, so

that those (things) which have been recently said, might more familiarly become known [innotescant] by being more often turned over (in the mind).

## Cap. XI.

*Quare tres personae simul non maius aliquid quam una.*

Sciendum est ergo, « tantam aequalitatem esse in Trinitate, ut ait Augustinus in octavo libro de Trinitate,[6] ut non solum Pater non sit maior quam Filius, sed nec Pater et Filius simul maius aliquid sint quam Spiritus sanctus, aut quaelibet persona minus aliquid sit quam ipsa Trinitas ». Quod autem ita sit, aliquo modo, si fieri potest, demonstrandum est. « Quantum ergo ipse Creator adiuvat, attendamus, inquit Augustinus in eodem,[7] quodmodo in hac Trinitate duae vel tres personae non sunt maius aliquid quam una earum ».

« Quod ibi magnum dicitur, aliunde magnum non est quam eo, quo vere est; quia ibi magnitudo ipsa veritas est et veritas essentia; non ergo ibi maius est quod verius non est. Non autem verius est Pater et Filius simul quam Pater solus vel Filius. Non ergo maius[8] aliquid uterque simul quam singulus eorum. Et quia aeque vere est etiam Spiritus sanctus, ideo Pater et Filius simul non sunt aliquid maius quam ipse, quia nec verius sunt. Item in essentia veritatis hoc est *verum esse*, quod est *esse*, et hoc est *esse*, quod est *magnum esse*: hoc est ergo *magnum esse* quod *verum esse*. Quod igitur ibi aeque verum est, et aeque magnum est. Quod ergo ibi plus veritatis non habet, non habet plus magnitudinus. Plus autem veritatis non habet quod verius non est. Non est autem verius una persona qua alia, vel duae quam una, vel tres simul quam singula. Non ergo plus veritatis habet una quam alia, vel duae quam una, vel tres simul quam singula. Sic ergo et ipsa Trinitas non est maius aliquid quam unaquaeque ibi persona, sed tam magnum quam singula. Non enim ibi maior est quae verior non est, ut ipsa veritas est magnitudo ».[9] Ecce modo convenienti et ratione catholica ostensum . . .

## Chapter XI

*For what reason are the Three Persons together not something greater than One (Person).*

It must be known, therefore, « that there is so great an equality in the Trinity », as (St.) Augustine says in the eighth book <u>On the Trinity</u>,[6] « that not only is the Father not greater than the son, but neither are the Father and the Son together something more than the Holy Spirit, or any Person less something than the Trinity Itself ». Moreover, what thus may be, in another manner, must be demonstrated, if it can come to be. « As much, therefore, as the Creator Himself assists, let us attend », says (St.) Augustine in the same (book),[7] « in what manner in this Trinity Two and/or Three Persons are not something more than One of Them ».

« There what is said (to be) “great”, is not great from elsewhere than by this, whereby It truly is; because There the magnitude is Truth Itself and the Truth the Essence; therefore, none is There more greatly [non ibi maius est], because none is there more truly. Moreover, not more truly is the Father and the Son together than the Father alone and/or the Son. Therefore Each together (is)[8] not something greater than Each One of Them. And because equally truly is also the Holy Spirit, for that reason the Father and the Son together are not something more than He, because neither are They more truly. Likewise, in the Essence of Truth “*to be true*” is that, which it is “*to be*”, and “*to be*” is that, which it is “*to be great*”: therefore “*to be great*” is that, which “*to be true*” (is). Therefore, what There (is) equally true, is also equally great. Therefore, what There does not have more of Truth, has not more of magnitude. Moreover, what is not more truly, has not more of Truth. Moreover, not more truly is one Person, than Another, and/or Two than One, and/or Three together than Each One. Therefore, One does not have more of truth than Another, nor Two than one, nor Three together than Each One. Therefore in this

manner too the Trinity Itself is not something greater than anyone Person There, but (is) as great as Each One. For there is not a greater There, which is not more true, as Truth Itself is the magnitude ». Behold, it has not been shown by fitting and catholic reason, . . .

[1] Sola Vat. *videntur*; et paulo infra *accipit* pro *accepit* et *dicuntur* pro *dicantur*.
[2] Vat. et edd. 4, 8 contra alias edd. et codd. *haec*.
[3] Codd. et edd. 1, 8 omittunt *Dei*, sed minus bene. Mox sola Vat. post *hoc idem* omittit *etiam*.
[4] Vat. et edd. 4, 5, 6, 9 contra alias edd. et codd. addunt *per omnia*.
[5] Dist. XXVI.
[6] Prooem. n. 1. — Mox post *aliquid* Vat. et plures edd. cum cod. D contra ceteros codd. et originale non bene *sunt* pro *sint*.
[7] Ibid. et in principio cap. 1. n. 2.
[8] Vat. cum plerisque edd. contra 1, 2 et originale addunt *est*, quod edd. 3, 7 melius transponunt legendo: *Non est ergo maius*. Immediate post codd. B C E et edd. 2, 3, 7 cum originali habent *utrumque* loco *uterque*.
[9] Quae praecedunt, leguntur ibid. c. 1. n. 2, sed non paucis a Magistro omissis, transpositis et mutatis.

[1] Only the Vatican edition has *they seem* [videntur], and a little below this *does . . . accept* [accipit] for *did . . . accept* [accepit] and *they are said* [dicuntur] in the indicative.
[2] The Vatican edition and editions 4 and 8, contrary to the other editions and codices, have *this* [haec] for *here the* [hic].
[3] The codices and editions 1 and 8, omit *of God* [Dei], but less well. Next only the Vatican edition after *On this account the same* [Propter hoc idem] omits *also* [etiam].
[4] The Vatican edition and editions 4, 5, 6, and 9, contrary to the editions and codices add *in all things* [per omnia].
[5] Distinction 26.
[6] Foreword, n. 1. — Next the Vatican edition and very many editions, together with codex D, contrary to all the other codices and the original, has the indicate *are* [sunt] rather than the subjunctive of indirect discourse.
[7] Ibid., and at the beginning of ch. 1, n. 2.
[8] The Vatican Edition, together with very many editions, contrary to editions 1 and 3 and the original, add *is* [est], which editions 3 and 7 transpose by reading: *There is not, therefore* [Non est ergo]. Codices B C and E, and editions 2, ,3 and 7, together with the original have the neuter form of *Each ( thing)* [utrumque] in place of the masculine *Each (Person)* [uterque].
[9] Those things which precede this, are taken from ibid., ch. 1, n. 2, but with not a few things omitted, transposed and changed by Master (Peter).

***p. 341***

est, quomodo indifferens sit magnitudo trium personarum, quia nec una maior est alia, nec duae maius aliquid quam una,[1] nec tres simul maius aliquid quam singula.

in what manner the magnitude of the Three Persons is un-differing, because neither is there One greater than Another, nor Two more something than One,[1] nor Three together something more than Each One.

### Cap. XII.

*Quod Deus non est dicendus triplex, sed trinus.*

Praeterea cum Deus dicatur trinus, non tamen debet dici triplex. Ibi enim non est triplicitas, uti summa est unitas et indifferens aequalitas. Unde Augustinus in libro sexto de Trinitate[2] ait: « Non, quoniam Deus Trinitas est, ideo triplex putandus est:

### Chapter XII

*That God is not to be said (to be) "threefold", but "triune".*

Besides, though God is said (to be) "Triune", He, however, ought not be said (to be) "threefold". For there is not a triplicity There, since [uti] the Unity is most high and the Equality un-differing. Whence (St.) Augustine in the sixth book On the Trinity[2]

alioquin minor esset Pater solus, vel Filius solus, quam simul Pater et Filius ». « Cum itaque tantus est Pater solus vel solus Filius, vel solus Spiritus sanctus, quantus est simul Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, nullo modo triplex dicendus est Deus. Non enim Pater cum Fiio et Spiritu sancto maior Deus est quam singuli eorum, quia non est quo crescat illa perfectio. Perfectus autem est et Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, et perfectus dicitur Deus singulus eorum. Et ideo Trinitas potius quam triplex dici debet ».

says: « Not, since God is the Trinity, must He for that reason be thought (to be) threefold: otherwise the Father alone, and/or the Son alone would be less, that the Father and the Son together ». « And when the Father alone and/or the Son alone, and/or the Holy Spirit alone is as great, as is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit together, in no manner is God to be said (to be) "threefold". For the Father with the Son and the Holy Spirit is not a greater God than Each of Them, because there is not (anything) whereby that perfection grows. Moreover, Perfect is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and Each One of Them is said (to be) the perfect God. And for that reason there ought rather be said "the Trinity", than "threefold".

« In rebus corporeis non tantum est una, quantum tres simul, et plus sunt duae quam una res; in Trinitate vero summa tantum est una persona, quantum tres simul, et tantum sunt duae, quantum una, et in se infinitae sunt »,[3] quia *non est finis magnitudinis* earum. Ac per hoc aperitur quod supra diximus,[4] scilicet quodomo et singula sunt in singulis, et omnia in singulis, et singula in omnibus, et unum in omnibus est, et unum omnia. Ecce iam ostendimus suffcienter, qualiter in Trinitate aliqua persona aliam non superet magnitudine.

« In corporeal things one is not as much as three together, and two are more than one thing; but in the Most High Trinity one Person is as much as Three together, and Two are as much as One, and in Themselves They are infinite »,[3] because *there is not end to* Their *magnitude*. And through this there is revealed [aperitur] what we have said above,[4] namely, in what manner both Each are in Each, and All in Each, and Each in All, and One in All, and One All. Behold we have already sufficiently shown, in what manner in the Trinity any Person does not surpass the Other in magnitude.

---

[1] Codd. A C D et edd. 1, 2, 3, 7 *nec duae una*, codd. B E *nec duae quam una*.
[2] Cap. 7. n. 9. — Sequens locus est ibid. c. 8.
[3] Ibid. cap. 10. n. 12. — Locus Scripturae est: Psalm. 144, 3.
[4] Cap. 3, 4 in fine et 11. — Vat. cum pluribus edd. contra codd. *superius dictum est* loco *supra diximus*; item Vat. cum cod. C et aliis edd., excepta 1, omittit *scilicet*; denique post *quodmodo* omittit *et* contra codd. A B C E et edd. 1, 8.

[1] Codices A C and D, and editions 1, ,2 3, and 7, read *nor Two One* [nec duae una], codices B and E read *nor Two than One* [nec duae quam una].
[2] Chapter 7, n. 9. — The following passage is ibid., ch. 8.
[3] Ibid., chapter 10, n. 12. — The verse of Scripture is Ps. 144:3.
[4] Chapters 3 and 4 at the end, and 11. — The Vatican edition, together with very many editions, contrary to the codices, has *has been said more above* [superius dictum est] in place of *we have said above* [supra diximus]; likewise the Vatican edition, together with codex C and the other editions, except edition 1, omits *namely* [scilicet], then after *in what manner* [quomodo] it omits *both* [et], contrary to codices A B C and E, and to editions 1 and 8.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
*S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae*
*atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis*

# Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

*Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis*

**PRIMI LIBRI**

## COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIX.

**De aequalitate trium personarum in Deo, in specie quoad magnitudinem.**

**PARS I.**
**De aequalitate per essentiae unitatem probata.**
ARTICULUS UNICUS.

### Quaestio I.

**Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 341-344.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

*Nunc postquam coaeternitatem trium personarum* etc.

## DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Terminatis duabus partibus, in quibus Magister egit de his quae pertinent ad essentiae unitatem et personarum pluralitatem singillatim, hic incipit tertia pars, in qua determinat personarum aequalitatem, quae simul respicit[1] pluralitatem et unitatem. Et haec pars habet tres partes. In *prima* proponit, in quibus consistat aequalitas. In *secunda* probat specialiter, ibi: *Nunc superest ostendere, quomodo* etc. In *tertia*, quia in probando propositiones dubias dixerat, ideo determinat, qualiter dictiones *exclusivae* accipiantur in divinis, infra distinctione vigesima prima: *Hic oritur quaestio ex praedictis trahens originem*.

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
*Cardinal Bishop of Alba*
*& Doctor of the Church*

# Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

*of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris*

**BOOK ONE**

## COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIX

**On the equality of the Three Persons in God, in particular, in regard to Their magnitude.**

**PART I**
**On the equality proven through the unity of the Essence.**
ARTICLE SOLE

### Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 341-344.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

*Now after we have introduced the coeternity of the Three Persons* etc..

## DIVISION OF THE TEXT

Having terminated the two parts, in which Master (Peter) dealt with those (things) which pertain to the Unity of the Essence and the plurality of the Persons, one by one, here he starts the third part, in which he determines the equality of the Persons, which simultaneously respects[1] the plurality and the Unity. And this part has three parts. In the *first* he proposes, in what (things) does the equality consist. In the *second* he proves (them) in particular [specialiter], there (where he says): *Now it remains to shown, in what manner* etc.. In the *third*, because in proving the propositions he had said (some things) doubtful, for that reason he determines, what kind of *exclusive* sayings [dictiones] are accepted among the divine, below in the

Twenty-First Distinction: *Here there arises the question, which treats of the origin of the aforesaid*.

*Prima* pars,[2] in qua proponit ea, in quibus aequalitas consistit, habet duas partes. In prima parte proponit, quod consistit in his tribus: aeternitate, magnitudine et potestate. In secunda, ne crederentur haec tria diversa, ostendit, quod haec sunt idem in Deo, secundo capitulo:[3] *Cumque enumerentur ista quasi divera* etc.

The *first*[2] part, in which he proposes those, in which the equality consists, has two parts. In the first part he proposes, that it consists in three (perfections): eternity, magnitude and power. In the second, lest these three be believed (to be) diverse, he shows that these are the same (thing) in God, in the second chapter:[3] *And since these are enumerated as diverse* etc..

*Nunc superest ostendere, quod magnitudine*. Haec est[4] *secunda* pars, in qua probat aequalitatem, et dividitur haec pars in duas. Supposito enim, quod in divinis sit aequalitas quantum ad aeternitatem, ostendit *primo* aequalitatem quantum ad magnitudinem; *secundo* quantum ad potestatem, infra distinctione vigesima: *Nunc ostendere restat, quomodo ali- / -qua etc.*

*Now, therefore, it remains to show, that in magnitude*. This is[4] the *second* part, in which he proves the equality, and this part is divided into two. For having supposed that among the divine there is an equality as much as regards eternity, he shows *first* that (there is) an equality as much as regards magnitude; *second* as much as regards power, below in the Twentieth Distinction: *Now it remains to show, in what manner Any* etc..

---

[1] Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis codd. et ed. 1 obnitentibus, *recipit*. Mox post *partes* Vat. addit *principales*.
[2] In Vat. additur *principalis*.
[3] Ex mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *secundo capitulo*. Paulo ante aliqui codd. ut aa bb cum ed. 1 post *sunt* adiungunt *unum et*.
[4] Vat., omissis verbis Magistri *Nunc superest* etc., loco *Haec est* ponit *Similiter*, deinde ob mutatam constructionem omittit particulam *et* ac *haec pars*.

[1] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, with the other codices and edition 1 striving against this, has *receives* [recepit]. Next the Vatican edition has *principal parts* [partes principales] for *parts* [partes].
[2] In the Vatican edition there is added *principal* [principalis].
[3] From the manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *in the second chapter* [secundo capitulo]. A little before this some codices, such as aa and bb, together with edition 1, after *these are* [haec sunt] insert *one and* [unum et].
[4] The Vatican edition, having omitted the words of Master (Peter), *Now, therefore, it remains etc.* [Nunc superset etc.], in place of *This is* [Haec est] put *Similarly* [Similiter], then on account of the changed construction it omits the particle *and* [et] and *this part* [haec pars].

---



*ali- / -qua etc*. *Prima* iterum pars habet duas. In prima[1] probat aequalitatem magnitudinis per essenitae unitatem. Secundo probat aequalitatem, excludendo omnem[2] inaequalitatem, ibi: *Sed iam nunc ad propositum redeamus*. Prima pars, in qua probat personarum aequalitatem quantum ad magnitudinem, habet duas. In prima probat per essentiae indivisionem;[3] in secunda per illam eandem ostendit, esse in personis circumincessionem, ibi: *Et inde est, quod Pater dicitur esse in Filio*.

*Any* etc.. Again, the *first* part has two (parts). In the first[1] he proves the equality of (Their) magnitude through the Unity of the Essence. Second he proves the equality, by excluding every[2] inequality, there (where he says): *But now presently let us return to the proposed*. The first part, in which he proves the equality of the Persons as much as regards (Their) magnitude has two (parts). In the first he proves it through the indivision[3] of the Essence; in the second through that same he shows, that among the Persons there is

an circumincession, there (where he says): *And hence it is, that the Father is said to be in the Son*.

**TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.**

Ad intelligentiam huius partis quaeruntur quatuor.

*Primo* quaeritur, utrum in divinis sit ponere aequalitatem.
*Secundo*, dato quod sic, utrum sit ibi summa aequalitas.
*Tertio*, utrum in divinis sit aequalitas cum conversione.
*Quarto*, utrum sit ibi aequalitas cum circumincessione.

**TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS**

For an understanding of this part four (things) are asked.

*First* there is asked, whether among the divine there is a positing of an equality.
*Second*, granted that (it is) so, whether there is There a most high equality.
*Third*, whether among the divine there is an equality with conversion.
*Fourth*, whether there is There an equality with circumincession.

# ARTICULUS UNICUS.

*De divinarum personarum aequalitate et eius proprietatibus.*

## QUAESTIO I.

*Utrum in divinis ponenda sit aequalitas.*

# ARTICLE SOLE

*On the equality of the Divine Persons and its properties.*

## QUESTION 1

*Whether equality is to be posited among the divine.*

**Circa primum,** quod sit ibi aequalitas, ostenditur:

1. Primo per illud quod dicitur in Symbolo:[4] « Totae tres personae coaeternae sibi sunt et coaequales ».

2. Item, hoc ipsum ostenditur *ratione* sic: omnis multitudo reducitur ad unitatem,[5] ergo omnis inaequalitas ad aequalitatem; sed unitas, a qua est omnis multitudo, est unitas increata: ergo et aequalitas, ad quam reducitur omnis inaequalitas, est aequalitas increata: ergo etc.

3. Item, omne quod perfectionis est, transferendum est ad divina; sed aequalitas est perfectionis in creatura: ergo etc.

4. Item, unum in substantia facit indentitatem, unum in quantitate aequalitatem, unum in qualitate facit similitudinem;[6] sed in divinis non tantum est unitas in substantia, sed etiam in quantitate, alioquin non esset ibi perfecta unitas: ergo non tantum est ibi identitas substantiae, sed et[7] aequalitas.

**Contra:** 1. Ubi aequalitas, ibi divisibilitas, quia simplex simplici non aequatur; sed in

**About the first,** that there is an equality There, is shown:

1. First through that which is said in the (Athanasian) Creed:[4] « The Three Persons are all coeternal and coequal to Themselves ».

2. Likewise, this very (thing) is shown *by reason* in this manner: every multitude is reduced to a unity,[5] therefore every inequality to an equality; but the unity, by which is every multitude, is the uncreated Unity. therefore even the equality, to which every inequality is reduced, is an uncreated equality: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, everything which belongs to perfection, must be transferred to divine (things); but equality in a creature belongs to (its) perfection: ergo etc..

4. Likewise, one in substance causes identity, one in quality equality, one in quality causes similitude;[6] but among the divine there is not only unity in substance, but also in quantity, otherwise there would not be There a perfect Unity: therefore not only is there an identity of substance There, but also[7] an equality.

**On the contrary:** 1. Where (there is) equality, there (is) divisibility, because the

divinis non est ponere divisibilitatem: ergo nec aequalitatem.

2. Item, ubi aequalitas, ibi quantitas, quia « propium est quantitatis, secundum eam aequale vel inaequale dici »;[8] sed in divinis non est ponere quantitatem, quia secundum Augustinum[9] « Deus est magnus sine quantitate »: ergo etc.

3. Item, ubi aequalitas, ibi finitas, quia ibi est commensuratio,[10] ergo mensura et finitas; sed in divinis est infinitas: ergo etc.

4. Item, ubi aequalitas, ibi diversitas, quoniam nihil est sibi aequale; sed in divinis est omnimoda unitas: ergo non est ibi aequalitas.

**CONCLUSIO.**

*Ponenda est in divinis aequalitas, quae consequitur quantitatem virtutis.*

**Respondeo:** Dicendum, quod aequalitas ponitur in divinis, secundum quod dicitur in Symbolo, et dicit Augustinus.[11]

simply is not equated to the simple; but among the divine there is no positing of divisibility: therefore neither of an equality.

2. Likewise, where (there is) equality, there (is) a quantity, because « it is proper to quantity, that according to it there be said "equal" and/or "unequal" »;[8] but among the divine there is no positing of quantity, because according to (St.) Augustine,[9] « God is great without a quantity »: ergo etc..

3. Likewise, where (there is) equality, there (is) a finity, because there is a commensuration,[10] therefore the measure is a finity; but among the divine there is an infinity: ergo etc..

4. Likewise, where (there is) equality, there (is) a diversity, since nothing is equal to itself; but among the divine there is an omnimodal Unity. therefore there is not an equality There.

**CONCLUSION**

*Among the divine there is to be posited an equality, which is consequent to the quantity of virtue.*

**I respond:** It must be said, that equality is posited among the divine, according to what is said in the (Athanasian) Creed, and (what St.) Augustine says.[11]

---

[1] Nonnulli codd. ut aa bb adiiciunt satis bene *parte*.
[2] Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *omnem*.
[3] Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 addit *sive unitatem*.
[4] Athanasiano.
[5] Vide Dionys., de Div. Nom. c. 5. et 13; Boeth., de Arithmetica, ubi diversimode haec propositio occurrit. Boeth. loc. cit. praesertim II. c. 1. etiam ostendit, omnem numerorum inaequalitatem reduci ad aequalitatem.
[6] Aristot., de Praedicam. c. de Quantitate et Qualitate, et V. Metaph. text. 15. (16.) et 20. (IV. c. 9. et 15.): Eadem enim sunt quorum substantia una; similia vero quorum qualitas una; aequalia autem quorum quantitas una.
[7] Multi codd. ut A F G H K V W X etc. cum ed. 1 minus bene omittunt *et*.
[8] Aristot., de Praedicam. c. de Quantitate. — Paulo ante in pluribus antiquis mss. ut A C R S T V Y et ed. 1 perperam *sed* loco *quia*.
[9] Libr. V. de Trin. c. 1. n. 2, in quo textu fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *est*.
[10] B. Albert. et Richard. a Med., hic a. 1, probant hoc per definitionem ex Geometria (Eluclidis) sumtam et infra d. 31. p. I. q. 1. arg. 2 ad opp. citatam: Aequale est, quod alteri suppositum non excedit nec exceditur. — Mox Vat., fere omnibus mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 repugnantibus, *ergo ubi est mensura, ibi finitas*,

[1] Not a few codices, such as aa and bb, add sufficiently well *part* [pars].
[2] Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted *every* [omnem].
[3] The Vatican edition, without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, adds *or Unity* [sive unitatis].
[4] The Athanasian Creed (where there read, in v. 24: And in this Trinity nothing prior or posterior, nothing greater or lesser; but the Three Persons are all coeternal and coequal to Themselves [Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus; sed totae tres personae coaeternae sibi sunt et coaequales.] ).
[5] See (St.) Dionysius (the Areopagite), On the Divine Names, chs. 5 and 13; (St. Severinus) Boethius, On Arithmetic, where this proposition occurs in a diverse manner. (St.) Boethius, loc. cit., chiefly in Bk. II, ch. 1, also shows, that every inequality of numbers is reduced to an equality.
[6] Aristotle, On the Predicaments, ch. "On Quantity and Quality", and Metaphysics, Bk. V, text 15 (16), and text 20 (Bk. IV, chs. 9 and 15): For the same are those of which (there is) one substance; however similar, those of which (there is) one quality; moreover equal, those of which (there is) one quantity.
[7] Many codices, such as A F G H K V W X etc.,

quo posito processus argumentationis tollitur.
[11] Vide hic lit. Magistri, in qua dicta Augustini allegantur.

together with edition 1, omit less well *also* [et].
[8] Aristotle, On the Predicaments, ch. "On Quantity". — A little before this in many ancient manuscripts, such as A C R S T V Y, and edition 1, there is had *but* [sed] in place of *because* [quia].
[9] On the Trinity, Bk. V, ch. 1, n. 2, in which text, trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *is* [est].
[10] Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus) and Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, prove this through the definition taken from (Euclid's) Geometry, and cited below in d. 31, p. I, q. 2, 2nd. opposing argument : The 'equal' is, that which, having supposed the other, does not exceed nor is exceeded'. — Next the Vatican, with nearly all the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3 fighting against this, reads *therefore where there is a measure, there (is) a finity* [ergo ubi est mensura, ibi finitas], which when posited destroys the progression of the argument.
[11] See here the text of Master (Peter), in which the sayings of (St.) Augustine are quoted.

---



Et ad hoc intelligendum notandum,[1] quod aequale et inaequale est propria passio consequens quantitatem. Quantitas autem dicitur dupliciter: *proprie*, scilicet quantitas molis, et *translative*, quantitas virtutis. Et quia illa[2] est propia passio quantitatis, consequitur utramque quantitatem; ubi ergo est ponere quantitatem virtutis, ibi est ponere aequalitatem vel inaequalitatem. Haec autem quantitas virtutis ponitur in spiritualibus et summe reperitur in divinis, quia haec quantitas non repugnat simplicitati, sed consonat; similiter nec aequalitas consequens istam quantitatem. Et quia altera pars contradictionis completior attribuenda est Deo, et aequalitas praeit inaequalitatem: ideo ponenda est aequalitas in divinis; et concedendae sunt rationes ad hoc.

And to understand this it must be noted,[1] that "equal and unequal" is a proper passion consequent to quantity. Moreover, "quantity" is said in a twofold manner: *properly*, that is, as a "quantity of mass", and *in a transferred manner* [translative], as a "quantity of virtue". And because that[1] is a proper passion of quantity, it is consequent to each quantity; where, therefore, there is a positing of a quantity of virtue, there is a positing of equality and/or inequality. But this quantity of virtue is posited among spiritual (things) and is found in a most high manner [summe] among the divine, because this quantity is not repugnant to simplicity, but is consonant (with it); similarly neither (is) equality consequent to this quantity. And because the other, more complete part of the contradiction is to be attributed to God, and equality goes before inequality: for that reason equality is to be posited among the divine; and the reasons for this are to be conceded.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod, ubi aequalitas, ibi divisibilitas; dicendum, quod verum est de aequalitate, quae consequitur quantitatem molis.

1. To that, therefore, which is objected in the contrary, that, where (there is) equality, there (is) divisibility; it must be said, that it is true of the equality, which is consequent to a quantity of mass.

2. Ad illud quod secundo obiicitur: ubi aequalitas, ibi quantitas; dicendum, quod verum est vel[3] secundum genus, vel secundum speciem; et quamvis nomen

2. To that, therefore, which is objected second: where (there is) equality, there (is) a quantity; it must be said, that it is true either[3] according to genus, and/or according

*quantitatis* non transferatur, transfertur tamen nomen *speciei*, ut magnitudo.[4]

to species; and although the name "*quantity*" is not transferred, yet the name "*species*" is transferred, as magnitude.[4]

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur: ubi aequalitas, ibi finitas; dicendum, quod aequalitas in creaturis duo importat, scilicet *conterminationem*[5] et *excessus privationem*: primum est incompletionis ratione limitationis, secundum perfectionis; ideo transfertur ratione secundi, non primi.

3. To that which is objected: where (there is) equality, there (is) finity; it must be said, that equality among creatures conveys two (notions), that is *co-termination*[5] and *privation of excess*: the first belongs to incompletion by reason of limitation, the second to perfection; for that reason it is transferred by reason of the second, not the first.

Posset tamen dici, quod infinitum, quod est incomprehensibile, secundum veritatem est ab infinito comprehensibile, et ideo commensurabile infinito et est *sibi* finitum.[6] Et ex hoc non sequitur: est commensurabile infinito, ergo finitum; immo magis infinitum; et[7] est ibi *quid* et *simpliciter*.

However it could be said, that the infinite, because it is incomprehensible, according to the truth is comprehensible by the infinite, and for that reason is commensurable to the infinite and is finite *to itself*.[6] And from this there does not follow: 'it is commensurable to the infinite, therefore (it is) finite'; nay rather '(therefore it is) infinite': and[7] there is (a fallacy <u>secundum</u>) <u>quid</u> and *simply (speaking)* there.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur: ubi aequalitas, ibi diversitas: dicendum, quod est diversitas *suppositorum* et diversitas *formae*.[8] Ad aequalitatem et similitudinem requiritur diversitas *suppositorum*, non autem *formae* diversitas, sed unitas. Quod autem consequitur in inferioribus ad diversitatem suppositorum numeratio formae vel quantitatis, hoc est imperfectionis; et ideo totum, quod est perfectionis, transfertur in Deum. Non tamen est in suppositis proprie loquendo *diversitas*, sed *distinctio*.[9]

4. To that which is objected: where (there is) equality, there (is) a diversity: it must be said, that (there) is a diversity of *supposits* and a diversity of *form*.[8] For an equality and similitude there is required a diversity of *supposits*, but not a diversity of *form*, but a unity (thereof). Moreover, because among inferiors to a diversity of supposits there follows a numbering of form and/or of quantity, this belongs to imperfection; and for that reason the whole, which belongs to perfection, is transferred into God. However, among supposits properly speaking is there not a *diversity*, but (rather) a *distinction*.[9]

## SCHOLION.

## SCHOLIUM

I. Ex sententia communi hae tres communes relationes *identitatis*, *aequalitatis* et *similitudinis* correspondent his tribus generibus: *substantiae*, *quantitati* et *qualitati*. Hanc doctrinam explicat Alex. Hal. (loc. infra cit.): « In his inferioribus ex unitate in substantia causatur identitas, ex unitate in quantitate aequalitas, ex unitate in qualitate similitudo, unde identitas, aequalitas, similitudo dicunt relationes fundatas per tria predicamenta. Iuxta istam similitudinem, quoniam est significare divinam substantiam ut *essentiam* et ut *quantam* et ut *qualem*, est ponere in divinis identitatem, aequalitatem et similitudinem. Sed quantitas in divinis transit in genus

I. According to the common sentence, these three common relations of *identity*, *equality* and *similitude* correspond to these three genera: *substance*, *quantity* and *quality*. Alexander of Hales (<u>loc</u>. <u>cit</u>., below) explains this doctrine: « Among these inferior (beings), out of a unity in substance there is caused an identity, out of a unity in quantity an equality, out of a unity in quality a similitude, whence "identity", "equality", "similitude" mean the relations founded through the three predicaments. According to this similitude, since there is a signifying of the Divine Substance as "*essence*", and as "*so great*" [quantam] and as "*of such a kind*" [qualem], there is a positing among

substantiae, et qualitas similiter, quia in divinis non est ponere nisi duo genera, scil. *substantiae* et *ad aliquid*. Aequalitas et similitudo dicunt relationes ut funadatas in substantia ». Insuper, sicut est duplex quantitas, propria scilicet sive quantitas *molis*, et impropria sive quantitas *virtutis* vel perfectionis (cfr. S. Thom., S. I. q. 42. a. 1. ad. 1.), ita etiam duplex distinguitur aequalitas, « quatenus consequitur utramque quanitatem ». Et sicut quantitas virtutis (quam S. Augustinus maluit nominare nomine magnitudinis, quam nomine quantitatis, ne insipientes accipiant occasionem errandi, existimando in Deo esse quantitatem molis orbem replentem) nobilior est quantitate molis, ita nobilior est aequalitas fundata super quantitatem virtutis, quam quae fundatur super quantitatem molis. Dici etiam potest, quod altera est aequalitas *proprie* dicta, altera vero *improprie*. Aequalitas *proprie* sumta est quaedam relatio praedicamentalis, fundata super unitate, quam res habent in genere quantitatis. Aequalitas vero *large* sumta est relatio extra genus quantitatis et potest fundari in quolibet ente, tam finito quam infinito, quatenus habet certum gradum in entibus. De Deo autem, qui est extra omne genus, relationes identitatis, aequalitatis et similitudinis praedicantur tantum in sensu transcendentali.

the divine of identity, equality and similitude. But quantity among the divine passes over into the genus of substance, and quality similarly, because among the divine there is not positing except of two genera, namely, of *substance* and *for something*. “Equality” and “similitude” mean the relations founded in the substance ». Moreover, just as there is a twofold quantity, namely, the proper or “quantity of *mass*”, and the improper or “quantity of *virtue* and/or of perfection” (cf. St. Thomas, Summa., I, q. 42, a. 1, in reply to n. 1), so also is there distinguished a twofold equality, « to the extent that it is consequent to each quantity ». And just as the quantity of virtue (which St. Augustine preferred to name with the name of “magnitude”, rather than with the name of “quantity”, lest fools take it as an occasion of erring, by estimating that the quantity of mass filling the globe is in God) is more noble than the quantity of mass, so is the equality founded upon the quantity of virtue more noble, than that which is founded upon the quantity of mass. It can also be said, that the one equality is *properly* said, but the other *improperly*. “Equality *properly* taken” is a certain relation of predicament, founded upon the unity, which the thing has in the genus of quantity. But “equality *broadly* taken” is the relation outside of the genus of quantity and cant be founded in any being, finite as much as infinite, to the extent that it has a certain grade among beings. But of God, who is outside of every genus, the relations of identity, equality and similitude are predicated only in the transcendental sense.

---

[1] Unus alterque codex ut G cum ed. 1 praemittit verbum *est*.
[2] Referas *illa* ad paulo supra posita *aequale et inaequale*, vel potius subintellige: aequalitas vel inaequalitas; cum quo concordat lectio cod. X, qui mox post *quantitatis* addit *scilicet aequalitas vel inaequalitas, ideo*; lectio autem Vat. et cod. cc, in qua verbo *consequitur* praefigitur *aequalitas*, incompleta est et contra antiquiores codd. nec non contra ed. 1.
[3] Supplevimus ex mss. et ed. 1 particulam *vel*.
[4] Cfr. supra d. 8. p. II. dub. 4.
[5] Codd. aa bb addunt *vel commensurationem*.
[6] Exhibemus lectionem maioris partis codd. ut A G H I L O P Q S T V Y etc. et ed. 1, dum ceteri codd. cum edd. 2, 3 loco *sibi* ponunt *ibi*, vel falso *infinitum* pro *finitum*; Vat. autem omittit *et est sibi finitum*.

[1] One or the other codex, such as G, together with edition 1, have the verb in its complete form *it must be noted* [notandum est].
[2] That is, the *equal and unequal* posited a little above this, and/or rather understand: equality and/or inequality; with which agrees the reading of codex X, which next after *of quanitity* [quantitatis] adds *that is, of equality and/or of inequality, for that reason* [scilicet aequalitas vel inaequalitas, ideo]; but the reading of the Vatican text and of codex cc, in which *equality* [aequalitatis] is placed as the subjects of *is consequent* [consequitur], is incomplete and contrary to the more ancient codices and to edition 1.
[3] We have supplied from the manuscripts and edition 1 the particle *either* [vel].
[4] Cfr. above d. 8, p. II, dubium 4.

[7] Vat. male et praeter fidem mss. et sex primarum edd. omittit *et*. Mox cod. X loco *quid* habet magis distincte *secundum quid*; complete diceretur: et est ibi fallacia secundum quid er simpliciter (cfr. Aristot., I. Elench. c. 4. 5.); fit siquidem transitus a finito sub aliquo respectu ad finitum simpliciter. Nam licet infinitum obiectum ab infinito intellectu comprehendatur eique sit commensuarabile, propter hoc tamen dici non potest, ipsum esse finitum simpliciter, sed tantum secundum quid; quia potentiae in ratione intelligendi infinitae respondet solummodo obiectum infinitum in ratione intelligibilis.

[8] Praeter lectionem in textum receptam reperiuntur in mss. variae lectiones; cod. K post verba *dicendum quod* addit *verum est ubi*; dein plures codd. ut A C R S U W falso: *ibi aequalitas suppositorum* loco *diversitas suppositorum*, cod. T vero primitus *dicendum, quod est ibi aequalitas suppositorum et unitas formae*, sed postea mutatum in *dicendum, quod est inaequalitas suppositorum et diversitas formae*. Lectio primitiva codicis T non est pernenda. Mox cod. K post *aequalitatem* addit *autem*, et post *similitudinem* adiungit *in divinis*.

[9] Vide supra d. 4. q. 2. et dubia circa litteram; item Alex. Hal., S. p. I q. 65. m. 1.

[5] Codices aa and bb add *and/or commensuration* [vel commensurationem].

[6] We exhibit the reading of the greater part of the codices, such as A G H I L O P Q S T V Y etc., and edition 1, while all the other codices, together with editions 2 and 3, in place of *to itself* [sibi] put *There* [ibi], and/or falsely *infinite* [infinitum] for *finite* [finitum]; but the Vatican edition omits *and is finite to itself* [et est sibi finitum].

[7] The Vatican edition badly, and not trusting in the manuscripts and six first editions, omits *and* [et]. Next codex X in place of *quid* has the more distinct *secundum quid*: the complete phrase should read: *and there is a fallacy secundum quid and simply speaking there* [et est ibi fallacia secundum quid er simpliciter] (cf. Aristotle, List of Sophistic Errors, Bk. I, chs. 4 and 5.); if indeed a passing over under any respect from the finite to the finite comes to be simply (speaking). For though an infinite object is comprehended by an infinite intellect, and is commensurable with it, yet on this account there cannot be said, that it is ‘finite’ simply (speaking), but only secundum quid; because only an object infinite in the reckoning of the intelligible responds to a power infinite in the reckoning of the intelligible.

[8] Besides the received text there are found in the manuscripts various readings; codex K after the words *it must be said that* [dicendum quod] adds *it is true where* [verum est ubi]; then very many codices, such as A C R S U W falsely read: *there is an equality of supposites* [est ibi aequalitas suppositorum] for *(there) is a diversity of supposits* [deversitas suppositorum], but codex T originally read *it must be said, that there is an equality of supposits and a unity of form*, [dicendum, quod est ibi aequalitas suppositorum et unitas formae], and afterwards was changed to read *it must be said, that there is an inequality of supposits and a diversity of forms* [dicendum, quod est inaequalitas suppositorum et diversitas formae]. The primitive reading of codex T is not to be spurned. Next codex K reads *Moreover, for an equality* [Ad aequalitatem autem], and after *similitude* [similitudinem] it adds *among the divine* [divinis].

[9] See above d. 4, q. 2, and the doubts on the text; likewise see Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 65, m. 1.

---



II. Quoad solut. ad 2. et assertionem ibi positam, quod « quamvis nomen quantitatis non transferatur, transfertur tamen nomen speciei », cfr. supra d. 8. p. II. dub. 4. — Quoad verba in solut. ad 4, quod « non est in divinis suppositis proprie loquendo diversitas, sed distinctio », cfr. infra d. 24. dub. 1. Magis explicatur haec solutio ab Alex. Hal. (loc. cit. ad 2.) his verbis: « Aequalitas in his inferioribus est interdum diversa essentialiter; nam in istis

II. In regard to the solution to n. 2 and the assertion posited there, that « although the name of “quantity” is not transferred, yet the name of “species” is transferred », cf. above d. 8, p. II, dubium 4. — In regards to the words in the solution to n. 4, that « among (the divine) supposits properly speaking is there not a diversity, but (rather) a distinction », cf. below d. 24, dubium 1. This solution is explained more by Alexander of Hales (loc. cit., in reply to n.

inferioribus diversitatem suppositorum sequitur diversitas essentiae in suppositis; non sic est in divinis, ubi diversitatem suppositorum concomitatur identitas essentiae; propter quod in divinis non est ponere diversitatem, sed distinctionem, sicut dicit Ambrosius. Unde aequalitas in divinis personis non requirit diversitatem, sed distinctionem; distinctio enim non toliit unitatem, sive identitatem; unde licet in divinis sit summa identitas, quia illam concomitatur distinctio, huius modi identitas non tollit aequalitatem ».

2) with these words: « Equality among these inferiors is essentially among diverse (things); for among those inferiors the diversity of essence in the supposits follows the diversity of the supposits; not so is it among the divine, where the identity of the Essence is concomitant with the diversity of the Supposits; on which account among the divine there is not a positing of diversity, but of a distinction, just as (St.) Ambrose says. Whence equality among the Divine Persons does not require diversity, but distinction; for distinction does not take away the Unity, or the identity; whence though among the divine there is a most high identity, because distinction is concomitant with that, an identity of this kind does not take away equality ».

III. Plura de aequalitate vide infra d. 31. a. 1. q. 1. 2. 3. — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 47. m. 1. — Scot., de hac et duabus seqq. in utroque scripto hic q. 1. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1, et d. 24. q. 2. a. 1; S. I. q. 42. a. 1. — B. Albert., hic a. 1; S. p. I. tr. 11. q. 47. n. 1. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 1. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 1. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 70. q. 1. — Durand., de hac et duab. seqq. hic q. 1. — Dionys. Carth., de hac et duab. seqq. hic q. 1. — Biel, hic q. 1. a. 1.

III. For more on equality, see below in d. 31, a. 1, qq. 1, 2 and 3. — Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 47, m. 1. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, on this and the following 2 questions, here in q. 1. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 1, and in d. 24, q. 2, a. 1; Summa., I, q. 42, a. 1. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 1; Summa., p. I, tr. 11, q. 47, n. 1. — Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 1. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, q. 1. — Giles the Roman., here in 1st. princ., q. 1. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 70, q. 1. — Durandus, on this and the following 2 questions, here in q. 1. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, on this and the following 2 questions, here in q. 1. — (Gabriel) Biel, here in q. 1, a. 1.

---



S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
*S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae*
*atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis*

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
*Cardinal Bishop of Alba*
*& Doctor of the Church*

# Commentaria in Quatuor Libros

# Commentaries on the Four Books of

# Sententiarum

*Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis*

**PRIMI LIBRI**

## COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIX.

**PARS I.**

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

### Quaestio II.

**Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 344-346.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

### QUAESTIO II.

*Utrum in divinis sit summa aequalitas.*

**Secundo quaeritur,** utrum in divinis sit summa aequalitas. Et quod sic, videtur hoc modo.

1. Sicut dicitur ab Augustino in libro de Fide ad Petrum,[1] « non dicitur aliquis maior alio, nisi aut quia praecedit aetate, ut quia excedit magnitudine, aut quia superat potestate », sed nihil horum est in divinis, ut probat Augustinus et Magister:[2] ergo nihil est ibi inaequalitatis: ergo est ibi summa aequalitas.

2. Item, non potest maior aequalitas cogitari,[3] quam ubi unum aequatur uni et unum pluribus et unum omnibus; sed in divinis tantus est Filius, quantus est Pater, et tantus Filius, quantus Pater et Spiritus sanctus, et tantus etiam,[4] quantus omnes tres: ergo etc.

3. Item, unitas in quantitate, sicut dictum est,[5] facit aequalitatem: ergo ubi summa unitas, ibi summa aequalitas; sed hoc est in divinis: ergo etc.

4. Item, status non est nisi in summo; sed status est in illa aequalitate per reductionem omnium ad ipsam: ergo etc.

# Sentences

*of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris*

**BOOK ONE**

## COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIX

**PART I**

ARTICLE SOLE

### Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 344-346.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

### QUESTION 2

*Whether among the divine there is a most high equality.*

**Second there is asked,** whether among the divine there is a most high equality. And that (it is) so, seems in this manner:

1. Just as there is said by (St.) Augustine in the book On the Faith to Peter,[1] « someone is not said to be greater than another, except either because it precedes (it) in age, or because it exceeds (it) in magnitude, or because it surpasses (it) in power », but nothing of these is among the divine, as (St.) Augustine and Master (Peter) proves:[2] therefore there is nothing of inequality There: therefore, there is a most high equality There.

2. Likewise, a greater equality cannot be thought,[3] than where one is equated to one and one to many and one to all; but among the divine the Son is as great, as the Father is, and the Son (is) as great, as the Father and the Holy Spirit, and as great also,[4] as all Three (are): ergo etc..

3. Likewise, unity in quantity, just as has been said,[5] causes [facit] equality: therefore where (there is) most high unity, there (is) most high equality; but this is among the divine; ergo etc..

4. Likewise, there is no standing-still [status] except in the highest [in summo]; but there is a standing-still in that equality

through the reduction of all (things) to it: ergo etc..

**CONTRA:** 1. Augustinus in libro octoginta trium Quaestionum:[6] « Si omnia essent aequalia, non essent omnia »: ergo omnimoda aequalitas tollit perfectionem.[7] Si ergo nihil ponendum in Deo, quod repugnat perfectioni, in divinis personis non est omnimoda aequalitas.

**ON THE CONTRARY:** 1. (St.) Augustine in the book of 83 Questions[6] (says): « If all were equal, all would not be »: therefore an omnimodal equality takes away perfection.[7] If, therefore, nothing must be posited in God, which is repugnant to perfection, among the Divine Persons there is not an omnimodal equality.

2. Item, maior est aequalitas, quae attenditur secundum quantitatem continuam et discretam, quam[8] secundum continuam tantum;[9] sed in divinis non est aequalitas secundum quantitatem discretam, quia ibi est trinitas et ita imparilitas: ergo in divinis non est omnimoda aequalitas.

2. Likewise, greater is the equality, which is attained according to a continuous and discrete quantity, than[8] according to a continuous one only;[9] but among the divine there is not a equality according to a discrete quantity, because there is a trinity and thus an inequality [imparilitas]: therefore among the divine there is not an omnimodal equality.

3. Item, maior est aequalitas, quae attenditur secundum potentiam et sapientiam et bonitatem, quam quae[10] secundum sapientiam et potentiam tantum; sed in divinis non est aequalitas secundum bonitatem: ergo non est ibi summa aequalitas. Probatio *minoris*: bonum est diffusivum sui;[11] sed magis diffundit se Filius quam Spiritus sanctus, quia producit sibi aequalem, et etiam Pater quam Filius: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, greater is the equality, which is attained according to power and wisdom and goodness, than which[10] (is attained) according to wisdom and power only; but among the divine there is not an equality according to goodness: therefore there is not a most high equality There. Proof of the *minor*: the good is diffusive of itself;[11] but the Son diffuses Himself more than the Holy Spirit, because He produces an Equal to Himself, and also the Father than the Son: ergo etc..

Quaeritur ergo, quare Augustinus non ostendit aequalitatem in[12] sapientia et bonitate? et iterum, quare non ex parte loci, sicut magnitudinis et etiam aliarum differentiarum quantitatis? Quod cum non faciat, non videtur assignare omnimodam aequalitatem, sed solum in parte;[13] aut si omnimodam ostendit, insufficienter procedit.

There is asked, therefore, for what reason did (St.) Augustine not show equality in[12] wisdom and goodness? and again, for what reason not on the part of place, just as of magnitude and even of the quantity of the other differences? Which since he did not do this, it seems that he did not assign an omnimodal equality, but only in part;[13] or if he did show an omnimodal one, he proceeds in an insufficient manner.

## CONCLUSIO.

*Summa est divinarum personarum aequalitas in aeternitate quoad originem, in magnitudine quoad omnia quae habent in se, in potentia quoad effectus.*

## CONCLUSION

*Most high is the equality of the Divine Persons in eternity in regard to (Their) origin, in magnitude in regard to all which They have in Themselves, in power in regards to (Their) effect.*

**RESPONDEO:** Dicendum, quod in divinis est summa aequalitas, et summa etiam assignatur ab Augu- /-stino, . . .

**I RESPOND:** It must be said, that among the divine there is a most high equality, and a most high one is also assigned by (St.) Augustine, . . .

[1] Cap. I. n. 4, ubi haec propositio ad Trinitatem applicata, non ut generalis, sicut hic exhibetur, invenitur.  Vide lit. Magistri, c. 1.
[2] Hic c. 1. seqq., in quibus etiam Augustini probationes reperies.
[3] Vat. cum cod. cc *excogitari*. Mox cod. W *si* loco *ubi*.
[4] Codd. non consentiunt inter se; maior eorum pars cum ed. 1 exhibet lectionem in textum receptam, alii ut V Z aa bb ff adiungunt *unus*, alii cum Vat. repetunt *Filius*.  Vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 11.
[5] In quarto fundam. praeced. q.  —  Paulo infra cod. Y *haec* pro *hoc*.
[6] Quaest. 41:  Quia non essent omnia, si essent aequalia.
[7] Fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 expunximus hic male additum *in divinis*, sicut et paulo infra post *nihil* adiunctum *est*; deinde substituimus *repugnat* loco *repugnet*, nec non adiecimus *personis* ac consequenter delevimus ut superfluum *ibi* post *non est*.
[8] In cod. bb additur bene *quae*.
[9] Quantitas *continua* est cuius partes sunt unitae; *discreta* vero cuius partes sunt ab invicem distiunctae, v. g. numerus.  Cfr. Aristot., de Praedicam. c. de Quantitate.
[10] In multis mss. ut A F H I T W X Y Z ee ff et ed. 1 deest *quae*.
[11] Haec propositio colligitur ex Dionys. libr. de Caelest. Hierach. c. 4. § 1. seq., et de Div. Nom. c. 4. § 1. seqq., ubi dicit, proprium esse divinae bonitate se aliis communicare.
[12] Codd. H M addunt *potentia*.
[13] Auctoritate plurium mss. ut G H I L O Y Z ff substituimus *parte* pro *partem*.

[1] Chapter I, n. 4, where this proposition, applied to the Trinity, is found not as a general one, as it is here exhibited.  See the text of Master (Peter), ch. 1.  [Trans. note:  (St.) Augustine speaks according to the differing senses  of the word *great* / maior, in the Latin language.]
[2] Here in ch. 1 ff., in which you will also find the proofs of (St.) Augustine.  [Trans. note: here the verb in the singular is understood to stand for each subject separately.]
[3] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, has *thought of* [excogitari].  Next codex W has *if* [si] in place of *where* [ubi].
[4] The codices do not agree among themselves; the greater part of them together with edition 1 exhibits the reading received in the text, others, such as V Z aa bb and ff, insert *One* [unus] as the subject of this clause, others together with the Vatican repeat *the Son* [Filius] for the same.  See here the text of Master Peter, ch. 11.
[5] In the fourth fundament of the preceding question.  —  A little below this codex Y has *the former (i. e. most high unity)* [haec] for *this (i.e. this relation of unity to quality)* [hoc].  [Trans. note:  In the next fundament, the “standing-still” [status] is said in respect of that to which all others are returned (reduced) as to their logical or exemplary cause.]
[6] Question 41:  Because all would not be, if all were equal.
[7] Trusting in very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged here the badly added *among the divine* [in divinis], just as a little before this after *nothing* [nihil] we have the explicit *must be* [est] of the main verb; then we have substituted the indicative form of *is repugnant* [repugnat] for the subjunctive one, and we have inserted *Persons* [divinis] and consequently deleted as superfluous the *There* [ibi] after *there is not* [non est].
[8] In codex bb there is added well *which* [quae].
[9] A *continuous* quantity is that of which the parts have been united; but a *discrete one* that of which the parts have been disjoined from one another, e.g. as is among numbers.  Cf. Aristotle, On the Predicaments, ch. “On Quantity”.
[10] In many manuscripts, such as A F H I T W X Y Z ee and ff, and edition 1, there is lacking *which* [quae].
[11] This proposition is gathered from (St.) Dionysius (the Areopagite), On the Celestial Hierarchies, ch. 4, § 1 ff., and On the Divine Names, ch. 4, § 1 ff. where he says, that it is proper to the Divine Goodness to communicate Itself to others.
[12] Codices H and M add *power* [potentia].
[13] On the authority of very many manuscripts, such as G H I L O Y Z and ff, we have substituted the ablative form for *part* [parte] fore the accusative.

---



Augu- /-stino, quoniam[1] sufficienter ostenditur remotio omnis inaequalitatis per illa tria, quae sunt *aeternitas*, *magnitudo* et *potentia*.
Horum trium distinctio et sufficientia ab

(St.) Augustine, since[1] there is sufficiently shown the removal of every inequality through those three, which are *eternity*, *magnitude* and *power*.
The distinction and sufficiency of these

aliquibus accipitur[2] sic. Quia enim in divinis non est extensio molis nec aggregatio multitudinis, ideo non est ibi quantitas continua intrinseca[3] nec discreta, sed loco eius est quantitas virtutis, quae tangitur per hoc membrum, quod est *potentia*. Quia vero Deus suo ambitu complectitur omnem durationem, ideo est ibi quantitas *aeternitatis* correspondens tempori. Quia vero ambitu suae immensitatis complectitur omnem locum et locatum, ideo est ibi quantitas *magnitudinis* correspondens loco. Et sic patet,[4] cum non sit aliam quantitatem accipere ibi, quod sufficienter in illis ostenditur aequalitas et consistit.

three is accepted[2] by some in this manner. For because among the divine there is no extension of mass nor aggregation of a multitude, for that reason there is no intrinsic,[3] continuous or discrete quantity There, but in its place there is a quantity of virtue, which is touched through that member (of the division), which is *power*. However, because God embraces in His ambit every duration, for that reason there is a quantity of *eternity* There corresponding to time. But because in the ambit of His own immensity there is embraced every place and (everything) placed, for that reason there is a quantity of *magnitude* There corresponding to place. And thus it is clear,[4] though there is no other quantity to accept there, that the equality is sufficiently shown and does consists in those (three).

Sed haec distinctio non est conveniens, tum quia non est in Deo nisi[5] quantitas virtutis; et ita non deberet ibi esse nisi unum membrum, nec debet illa distingui contra alias; tum etiam, quia magnitudo in divinis non tantum attenditur quantum ad ambitum localitatis, sed etiam quantum ad intensionem bonitatis. Unde dicitur in sexto libro de Trinitate,[6] quod in « spiritualibus idem est maius et melius ». Et propter hoc quantitas virtutis non tantum attenditur in operatione, sed etiam in re[7] considerata in omnimoda absolutione.

But this distinction is not fitting, both because there is in God no (quantity) but[5] a quantity of virtue; and thus there ought not have been but one member (of the division) there, nor ought the former be distinguished against the latter; and also, because magnitude among the divine is not only attained as much as regards the ambit of locality, but also as much as regards the intensity [intensionem] of goodness. Whence there is said in the sixth book On thr Trinity,[6] that in « spiritual (things) more and better are the same ». And on this account a quantity of virtue is not only attained in operation, but also, in the matter[7] considered [in re considerata], in an omnimodal absolution.

Ideo possumus aliter horum trium distinctionem et sufficientiam assignare. In omni quod est, contingit hanc triplicem considerationem habere. Potest enim aliquid considerari in comparatione ad suam *originem* sive a parte ante; et sic unum maius est altero, quando origo eius est prior; et contra hoc est aequalitas *aeternitatis*. Potest iterum considerari *in se*; et sic dicitur unum altero maius, quia maioris extensionis, vel quia maioris valoris. contra hanc[8] est in Deo aequalitas *magnitudinis*, ut haec aequalitas non tantum dicatur per comparationem ad localitatem, sed etiam ad sapientiam et bonitatem et ad omne quod facit alterum altero dici maius, quia[9] melius. Unde

For that reason we can assign the distinction and sufficiency of these three in another manner. In everything which is, it happens that there is this threefold manner of being considered [hanc triplicem considerationem habere]. For something can be considered in comparison to its own *origin* or on the part of 'what is before' [a parte ante], and in this manner one is greater than the other, when its origin is prior; and (divided) against this is the equality of *eternity*. Again it can be considered *in itself*; and in this manner one is said (to be) greater than the other, because (it is) of a greater extension, and/or of a greater value: against this[8] there is in God the equality of *magnitude*, so that this

Augustinus et Magister in hac distinctione probant aequalitatem magnitudinis per aequalitatem virtutis sive in virtute. Potest etiam tertio considerari per comparationem ad *effectum*: et sic dicitur maius, quia potentius; et contra hoc est aequalitas *potenitae*. Quoniam igitur rem[10] non contingit pluribus modis considerari, si est aequalitas in istis, summa est; et cum ostenditur in istis, summa ostenditur, et perfecta inductione proceditur.

equality is not said through a comparison to locality, but also to wisdom and goodness and to everything which causes the one to be said (to be) greater than the other, because[9] (it is) better. Whence (St.) Augustine and Master (Peter) in this distinction prove the equality of magnitude through the equality of virtue or in virtue. Third, it can also be considered through a comparison to *effect*: and in this manner it is said (to be) greater, because (it is) more powerful; and against this is the equality of *power*. Therefore, since it does not happen that the matter [rem][10] be considered in more manners (than these), if there is equality in these (three members), it is most high; and when it is shown (to be) in these, it is shown (to be) most high; and (in this division the argument) is advanced by a perfect induction.

Et sic patet illud[11] quod ultimo quaerebatur.

And thus is clear that[11] which was objected last.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur primo, quod aequalitas repugnant perfectioni; dicendum, quod verum est: perfectioni *universi*, quae aggregata est ex diversitate, non sic est in *Deo*.

1. To that, therefore, which is objected first, that equality is repugnant to perfection; it must be said, that it is true: to the perfection of *each and every one* [universi], which (perfection) has been aggregated out of a diversity; not so is it in *God*.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod maior est aequalitas secundum utramque quantitatem etc.; dicendum, quod summa aequalitas non est in quantitate continua nec discreta, quia ibi unum non aequatur pluribus; sed hic[12] est perfectissima aequalitas: ideo solum secundum quantitatem virtutis attenditur.

2. To that which is objected, that there is a greater equality according to each quantity etc.; it must be said, that a most high equality is not in a continuous nor a discrete quantity, because there one is not equated to many; but here[12] there is the most perfect equality: for this reason it is only attained according to the quantity of virtue.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur de bonitate, quia diffusivum etc.; dicendum, quod emanatio personae non attenditur secundum rationem *bonitatis* essentiae, sed magis *fecunditatis* personae vel in persona; et ideo non sequitur, quodsi Spiritus sanctus non producit, quod propter hoc habeat minus de bonitate. Unde notandum, quod duplex est diffusio, scilicet *intra* vel[13] *extra*. Diffusio *intra* est, quando persona procedit a persona in[14] unitate naturae; et haec non est proprie diffusio, et haec non consequitur bonum, quia *bonum*, sed bonum in *hypostasi*, quae aliam producere nata est; et ideo secundum hanc diffusionem non dicitur una persona altera melior. Est[15] alia diffusio *extra*, quae attenditur in productione effectus; et secundum hanc

3. To that which is objected concerning goodness, that (it is) diffusive etc.; it must be said, that the emanation of a Person is not attained according to the reckoning of the *goodness* of the Essence, but rather of the *fecundity* of the Person and/or in the Person; and for that reason it does not follow, that if the Holy Spirit does not produce, that on this account He has less of goodness. Whence it must be noted, that there is a twofold diffusion, that is, *within* [intra] and/or[13] *outside of* [extra]. Diffusion *within* is when a person proceeds from a person in[14] the unity of a nature; and this is not properly diffusion, and this is not consequent to the good, because (it is) *good*, but to the good in a *hypostasis*, which is bound to produce another; and for this

rationem attenditur diffusio proprie et ratio boni. Et quia in hac una persona alteram non excedit, quia indivisa sunt opera Trinitatis; ideo hac non est una melior alia.[16]

reason according to this diffusion one Person is not said (to be) better than the Other. The other is[15] the diffusion *outside of*, which is attained in the production of an effect; and according to this reckoning there is attained a diffusion properly (speaking) and the reckoning of the good. And because in this one Person does not exceed the Other, because the works of the Trinity are undivided; for that reason by this One is not better than Another.[16]

---

[1] Codd. L O *quam* loco *quoniam*, qui et mox ponunt *ostendit remotione* pro *ostenditur remotio*.
[2] Cod. W *ostenditur*.
[3] Vat. *extensiva* pro *intrinseca*, sed obstat auctoritas mss. et ed. 1. Explicationem accipe ex Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 47. m. 5, qui locus hic in Scholio legitur. Omnino idem dicit B. Albert. (S. p. I. tr. 11. q. 47. m. 2): Dicendum, quod in veritate quantitas in creatis, penes quam attenditur aequalitas, duplex est, scil. magnitudinis et virtutis. Et ea quae est magnitudinis duplex est., scil. *intus* et *extra* mensurans; intus: longitudo, latitudo, profundum; extra: locus. Similiter esse rei, ut dicit Gilbertus, mora mensuratur; et haec mora est tempus. Quantitas autem virtutis proprie non mensuratur nisi obiecto circa quod est virtus. Et dicimus eos aequales virtute, qui et in aequalia possunt obiecta, sive illa virtus sit intellectualis sive operativa. Cfr. etiam B. Albert, hic a. 3.
[4] Fide mss. et ed. 1 expunximus additum *quod*.
[5] Mendum Vat., in qua omittitur *nisi*, correximus ex mss. et ed. 1. Paulo infra cod. I *deberet* loco *debet*.
[6] Cap. 8. n. 9.
[7] Vat. minus congrue et contra antiquiores codd. nec non ed. 1 *ut res* pro *in re*.
[8] Cod. X *hic*.
[9] Cod. T *et* loco *quia*.
[10] Vat. cum cod. cc, fundamentum argumentationis repetens, minus bene nec non contra antiquiores codd. cum ed. 1 *ergo ratio aequalitatis* loco *igitur rem*.
[11] Ex plurimis mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *illud* et in principio sequentis propositionis *ergo*.
[12] Fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *hic* pro *haec*.
[13] Cod. Y *et* loco *vel*.
[14] Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis mss cum ed. 1 obnitentibus, omittit male *in*. Mox post *diffusio*, multis codd. ut A C D E K R S T U X etc. cum edd. 2, 3 consentientibus, posuimus *et haec* pro *et hoc*. Dein nonnulli codd. ut A Y *sequitur* loco *consequitur*.
[15] In cod. M additur *et*.
[16] Vat. cum uno alterve codice *altera*. Paulo ante cod. O post *ideo* adiungit *in*.

---

[1] Codices L and O read *which (most high equality)* [quam], and next they put *he shows by the removal* [ostendit remotione] for *there is shown the removal* [ostenditur remotio].
[2] Codex W reads *is shown* [ostenditur].
[3] The Vatican edition has *extensive* [extensiva] for *intrinsic* [intrinseca], but the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1 withstand this. The reason for this is offered by Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 47, m. 5, and is cited here in the Scholium. Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus) says entirely the same thing (Summa., p. I, tr. 11, q. 47, m. 2): It must be said, that in truth quantity among created things, from within which an equality is attained, is two fold, namely, (that) of magnitude and (that) of virtue. And those which belong to magnitude are twofold, namely, measuring *from within* [intus] and *outside of*; from within: length, width, depth; outside of: place. Similarly the "being" of a thing, as Gilbert (of Porretain) says, is measured by a delay [mora], and this delay is time. But a quantity of virtue is not properly measured except by the object about which the virtue is. And we say that those (are) equal in virtue, which can also be applied to equals [et in aequalia possunt obiecta], whether that virtue is intellectual or operative. Cf. also Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 3.
[4] Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged the added *that* [quod].
[5] The error of Vatican edition, in which there is omitted *but* [nisi], we have corrected from the manuscripts and edition 1. A little below this codex I has *ought . . . have been* [deberet] for *ought . . . be* [debet].
[6] Chapter 8, n. 9.
[7] The Vatican edition less congruously, and contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1, has *as the matter* [ut res] for *in the matter* [res].
[8] Codex X has *on the contrary this* [contra hic] for *against this there* [contra hoc].
[9] Codex Y has *and* [et] in place of *because* [quia].
[10] The Vatican edition together with codex cc, repeating the fundament of the argument, has less well and contrary to the more ancient codices together with edition 1, reads *Therefore, since the reckoning of equality does not happen* [Quoniam ergo ratio aequalitatis] for *Therefore, since it does not happen that the matter* [Quoniam igitur rem].
[11] From very many manuscripts and edition 1, we

have supplied *that* [illud] and at the beginning of the following proposition *therefore* [ergo].

[12] Trusting in the very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *here there* [hic] for *this* [haec].

[13] Codex Y has *and* [et] in place of *and/or* [vel].

[14] The Vatican edition together with codex cc, with the other manuscripts together with edition 1 striving against this, omits badly *in* [in]. Next after *diffusion* [diffusio], with the consent of many codices, such as A C D E K R S T U X etc., together with editions 2 and 4, we have put *and this (diffusion)* [et haec] for *and this* [et hoc]. Then not a few codices, such as A and Y, have *does not follow* [non sequitur] in place of *is not consequent to* [non consequitur].

[15] In codex M there is added *also* [et].

[16] The Vatican edition together with one or the other codex reads *the Other* [altera]. A little before this codex O after *for that reason* [ideo] reads *in this (Trinity)* [in hac] for *by this (reckoning)* [hac].

---

***p. 346***

## SCHOLION.

I. In conclusione omnes conveniunt. Sed circa S.Augustini probationem et circa suficientiam membrorum divisionis, quae ponit, duplex affertur expositio. Prima, quae est Alexandri et Alberti, S. Doctori non probatur; secundam et meliorem cum ipso approbat etiam S. Thom., S. I. q. 42. a. 1. ad 1. Ut funadmenta primae opinionis melius perspiciantur, haec ex Alex. Hal. (loc. infra cit.) referimus: « Aequalitas respicit quantitatem, sive quod per modum quantitatis signatur. Omnis autem quantitas aut est mensurans intra, aut extra: si intra, aut est virtutis, aut molis; quantitas vero molis non cadit in divinis, sed quantitas *virtutis*; et hoc dicitur per *potentiam*. Item quantitas mensurans extra est duplex, scil. tempus et locus; et quantitati, quae est *tempus* in inferioribus, respondet *aeternitas* in divinis; ei autem quantitati, quae est *locus*, respondet *magnitudo* in divinis, non qua Deus circumscribatur in loco, sed qua est inter omnia non inclusus, et qua ipse continent et locat omnia. Sic ergo quantitas in divinis est *virtutis*, quae est *potentia*; et *durationis*, quae est aeternitas; et *locationis* sive continentiae activae, qua ipse continet et local omnia, et haec dicitur *magnitudo*. Quia ergo in Deo non est ponere pluribus modis quantitatem, ideo quantum ad haec tria solum in divinis assignatur aequalitas ».

## SCHOLIUM

I. In the conclusion all agree. But about St. Augustine's proof and about the sufficiency of the members of the division, which he posits, a twofold exposition is given. The first, which belongs to Alexander (of Hales) and (St.) Albertus (Magnus), is not proven (in the response) of the Seraphic Doctor; the second and better even St. Thomas approves with him in Summa., I, q. 42, a. 1, in reply to n. 1. So that the foundations of the first opinion be better considered, we cite this passage from Alexander of Hales (loc. cit., below): « Equality looks back to quantity, or to that which is marked though the standard of measure of a quantity. But every quantity either is one measuring within [intra], or outside of [extra]: if within, it is either (one) of virtue, or (one) of mass; but a quantity of mass does not occur among the divine, but a quantity of *virtue* (does); and this is said through *power*. Likewise a quantity measuring outside of is twofold, namely, time and place; and to the quantity, which is *time* in inferior things, corresponds *eternity* among divine ones; but to that quantity, which is *place*, there corresponds *magnitude* among the divine, not whereby God is circumscribed in a place, but whereby He is among all as One non enclosed; and whereby He contains and locates all things. Therefore in this manner quantity among the divine belongs to the *virtue*, which is *power*, and to the *duration*, which is (His) eternity; and to the *location* or

active continence, whereby He contains and locates all things, and this is said (to be His) magnitude. Therefore, because in God there is no positing of quantity in more manners (than this), for this reason equality among the divine is assigned only as much as regards these three ».

II. Alex. Hal. S. p. I. q. 47. m. 5. — B. Albert., hic a. 3; S. p. I. tr. 11. q. 47. m. 2. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 1. 3. — Aegid R., hic 1. princ. q. 3. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 70. q. 2.

II. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 47, m. 5. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 3; Summa., p. I, tr. 11, q. 47, m. 2. — Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 2. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, qq. 1 and 3. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st. princ., q. 3. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 70, q. 2.

---

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
*S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae*
*atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis*

# Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

*Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis*

**PRIMI LIBRI**

## COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIX.

**PARS I.**

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

**Quaestio III.**

**Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 346-347.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
*Cardinal Bishop of Alba*
*& Doctor of the Church*

# Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

*of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris*

**BOOK ONE**

## COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIX

**PART I**

ARTICLE SOLE

**Question 3**

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 346-347.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

### QUAESTIO III.

*Utrum aequalitas divinarum peronsarum sit*

### QUESTION 3

*Whether the equality of the Divine Persons*

*reciproca.*

**Tertio quaeritur,** utrum in divinis sit aequalitas cum conversione. Et quod non, videtur hoc modo.

1. Chrysostomus[1] super illud ad Hebraeos primo: *Qui cum sit splendor* etc.: « Filius est aequalis Patri, non Pater Filio ».

2. Item, Hilarius:[2] « Imago, si perfecte implet illud cuius est ipsa, coaequatur ei, non illud suae imagini ».

3. Item, Augustinus in primo libro de Doctrina christiana:[3] « In Patre unitas, in Filio aequalitas »: ergo videtur, quod Pater non sit aequalis Filio, ut Filius Patri.

4. Item, Dionysius:[4] « In causalibus et causatis non recipimus reciprocationem »; sed Pater est principium Filii: ergo etc.

**Contra:** 1. Omne relativum aequiparantiae denominat extrema secundum modum consimilem;[5] sed aequalitas est relatio aequiparantiae: ergo similis reciprocatio.

2. Item, unum in quantitate facit aequalitatem; sed sicut Filius est unum cum Patre, ita Pater unum cum Filio quantum ad substantiam et quanitatem: ergo est ibi reciprocatio.

3. Item, aequalitas mutua et reciprocata[6] maior est quam non reciprocata: ergo si in divinis est summa aequalitas, patet etc.

4. Item, omne quantum comparatum quanto aut est maius, aut minus, aut aequale; sed Pater est quantus virtute, et similiter Filius: aut ergo Pater est maior virtute Filio, aut minor, aut aequalis; sed non maior aut minor: ergo aequalis.[7]

[1] Homilia 2. ad Hebr. n. 2. ait: « Per *splendorem* vero essenitae aequalitatem ostendit et eius cum

*is reciprocal.*

**Third there is asked,** whether among the divine there is equality with the conversion (of the Persons). And that (there is) not, seems in this manner:

1. (St. John) Chrysostom[1] on that (verse) in the first (chapter of the Letter) to the Hebrews: *Who, since He is the splendor* etc.: (says), « The Son is equal to the Father, not the Father to the Son ».

2. Likewise, (St.) Hilary (of Poitiers says):[2] « An image, if it perfectly fills that of which it itself is, is co-equated to it, not it to its own image ».

3. Likewise, (St.) Augustine in the first book On Christian Doctrine (says):[3] « In the Father unity, in the Son equality »: therefore it seems, that the Father is not equal to the Son, as the Son (is) to the Father.

4. Likewise, (St.) Dionysius (the Areopagite says):[4] « Among those things which belong to a cause [causalibus] and the caused [causatis] we do not receive reciprocation »; but the Father is the principle of the Son: ergo etc..

**On the contrary:** 1. Everything relative to an equiparancy [aequiparantiae] denominates extremes according to a completely similar standard of measure [modum];[5] but equality is a relation of equiparancy: therefore (it is) a similar reciprocation.

2. Likewise, (being) “one in quantity” causes equality; but just s the Son is one with the Father, so the Father one with the Son, as much as regards substance and quantity: therefore there is a reciprocation There.

3. Likewise, a mutual and reciprocated[6] equality is greater than a non-reciprocated one. therefore if among the divine there is a most high equality; it is clear that etc..

4. Likewise, every quantum compared to a quantum either is greater, or lesser, or equal; but the Father is so much in virtue, and the Son similarly: therefore, either the Father is greater in virtue than the Son, or lesser, or equal; but not greater or lesser: therefore equal.[7]

[1] In the Second Homily on the Letter to the Hebrews, n. 2 he says: « However, through *splendor* (St. Paul)

Patre propinquitatem . . . Deinde subiunxit: *Et character seu figura*. Figura enim seu character est alius ab exemplari prototypo; alius autem non omnino, sed in eo, quod attinet ad hypostasin. Nam hic quoque character ostendit, nullam esse diversitatem, sed plane in omnibus perfectam similitudinem eius cuius est character et figura ». In Comment. super IV. libr. Sent. ad Hannibaldum Hannibaldensem Romanum, quod inter opera S. Thomae habetur, hic q. 1. a. 2. idem textus occurit et *Glossae Chrysostomi* adscribitur. Sed verbotenus in Glossa ordinaria non invenitur. In fine Glossae dicitur: « Splendor autem et figura sicut et *imago* proprie ad personam Filii referuuntur et relative dicuntur ». — Homil. 75. (al. 74.) n. 4. in Ioan. a Chrysosomo dicitur: « Si quis vero dixerit, maiorem esse Patrem, *ut Filii principium*, non huic contradicemus. Ad hoc non facit Filium alterius esse substantiae ». Quae verba sicut et ea quae ex Glossa sunt allegata, eatenus hic attentione digna sunt, quia S. Bonav. in corp. quaest. conceptibus *imitationis* et *subauctoritatis* utitur ad stabiliendam secundam conclusionis partem, scil, sub aliquo respectu inter Patrem et Filium non esse aequalitatem mutuam.

[2] August., VI. de Trin. c. 10 n. 11, sententiam Hilarii de his tribus nominibus, quae Trinitati appropriantur: aeternitas, imago et munus, referens proponit ista verba de imagine. Vide infra d. XXXI. p. II. in princ. lit. Magistri.

[3] Cap. 5. n. 5.

[4] De Div. Nom. c. 9. § 6, ubi initium huius textus in Graeco sic exhibetur □□□ □□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□, quod diverse a diversis transfertur; codd. cum ed. 1 praestant lectionem in textum recpetam; Vat. loco *causalibus* ponit *causis*.

[5] Relatio aequiparantiae communiter definitur: est ea cuius extrema sunt eiusdem rationis seu eodem nomine nominantur v. g. amicus (est enim amicus amici amicus), similis, aequalis; huic opponitur relatio disquiparantiae i. e. cuius extrema sunt alterius rationis, ut realtio patris ad filium.

[6] Postulantibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1, substituimus *reciprocata* pro *reciproca*.

[7] Mutila lectio Vat. et cod. cc, in qua verba *sed non maior aut minor: ergo aequalis* omittuntur, resarcitur ope vestusiorum mss. et ed. 1.

shows (His) equality to the Essence and His proximity with the Father . . . Then he subjoins: *And the Character or Figure*. For a figure or character is other than the exemplary prototype; but not entirely other, but in this, that it attains to the hypostasis. For this Character also shows, that there is not diversity, but plainly in all things that (He is) the perfect Similitude of Him of whom He is the Character and Figure ». In the Commentary on Book IV of the Sentences, according to the Roman, Hannibaldus of Hannibaldus, which is had among the works of St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 2, the same text occurs and is ascribed to *Chrysostom's Gloss*. But it is not found word-for-word in the Glossa Ordinaria. Ad the end of the Glossa there is said: « But "splendor" and "figure", just as even "*image*", are properly referred to the Person of the Son and are relatively said ». — In the 75th Homily, n. 4, On the Gospel of St. John, there is said by (St. John Chrysostom): « If anyone, however, will have said, that the Father is greater, *as the principle of the Son*, we will not contradict him. According to this, he does not make the son belong to another substance ». Which words, just as also those which have been quoted from the Gloss, are worthy of attention here to this extent, that St. Bonaventure in the body of the question uses the concepts of *imitation* and *subauthorship* to establish the second part of the conclusion, namely, that under some respect there is not a mutual equality among the Father and the son.

[2] (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, ch. 10, n. 11, referring to the sentence of (St.) Hilary concerning these three names, which are appropriated in the Trinity: "eternity", "image" and "gift" [munus], proposes these words concerning "image". See below in Distinction XXXI, p. 2, at the beginning of Master (Peter)'s text.

[3] Chapter 5, n. 5.

[4] On the Divine Names, ch. 9, § 6, where the beginning of this text is exhibited in the Greek in this manner: □□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□, which are translated diversely by diverse authors: the codices together with edition 1 offer the reading received in the text; the Vatican edition has *causes* [causis] in place of *those thing which belong to a cause* [causalibus].

[5] A relation of equiparancy is commonly defined: that relation of which the extremes are of the same reckoning and are named with the same name, v. g. "friend" (for a friend is a friend of a friend), "similar", "equal"; to this is opposed the relation of disequiparancy, i. e. the relation of which the extremes are of another reckoning, as the relation of father to son.

[6] As required by the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *reciprocated* [reciprocata] doe *reciprocal* [reciproca].

[7] The mutilated reading of the Vatican edition and of codex cc, in which the words *but not greater or lesser: therefore equal* [non maior aut minor: ergo aequalis], is repaired with the help of the older manuscripts and edition 1.

**CONCLUSIO.**

*Relatio aequalitatis in divinis est reciproca; sed actus coaequationis non dicitur de Patre respectu Filii.*

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod aequalitas est ibi cum conversione,[1] non tantum quia *divina*, sed etiam quia aequalitas *de sui ratione* dicit reciprocationem in quantum *aequalitas*. Et[2] secundum hoc credendum est, quod Pater est aequalis Filio et Filius Patri.

Et ad intellgenitam obiectorum notandum,[3] quod dupliciter est loqui de aequalitate: aut prout dicit *respectum aequiparantiae*, aut prout ultra respectum concernit *actum coaequationis*.[4] In quantum dicit *respectum aequiparantiae*, sicut ostendunt rationes, necesse est, quod sit ibi reciprocatio; sed in quantum ulterius concernit *actum coaequationis*, sic dicit rationem imitationis; et sic non convenit Patri respectu Filii, quia importaret subauctoritatem in Patre.[5] Unde non dicitur Pater coaequari Filio, quia Filium non imitatur nec perfecte nec imperfecte. Et est *simile*, si dicatur: *hoc cum illo*. Potest enim dupliciter intelligi: aut[6] prout dicit duorum *coniunctionem*; et sic de necessitate attenditur secundum conversionem; si enim iste vadit cum illo, necesse est etiam, quod verum sit e converso. Alio modo *hoc cum illo* dicit *associationem*, et ita quandam subauctoritatem in associante, et sic dicitur, quod miles vadit cum rege, non e converso, quia miles associat regem,[7] non e converso. Similiter intelligendum est in aequalitate.

1. 2. 3. 4. Et ex his patent auctoritates Sanctorum, quia[8] loquuntur de aequalitate secundo modo, praeter illam Dionysii, ad quam respondendum, quod non habet

**CONCLUSION**

*The relation of equality among the divine is reciprocal; but the act of co-equation is not said of the Father in respect to the Son*.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that there is equality with conversion[1] There, not only because (the quality is) *divine*, but also because equality *from its own reckoning* means a reciprocation inasmuch as (there is) an *equality*. And[2] according to this it must be believed, that the Father is equal to the Son and the Son to the Father.

And for an understanding of the objections it must be noted,[3] that to speak of "equality" is in a two fold manner: either insofar as it means *the respect of equiparancy*, or insofar as beyond (this) respect it concerns the *act of co-equation*.[4] Inasmuch as it means the *respect of equiparancy*, just as the reasons show, it is necessary, that there be a reciprocation There; but inasmuch as it concerns further the *act of co-equation*, thus it means the reckoning of imitation; and in this manner it does not befit the Father in respect to the Son, because it would convey a subauthority in the Father.[5] Whence the Father is not said to be co-equated to the Son, because He does not imitate the Son, neither perfectly nor imperfectly. And (this) is similar, as if there were said: *this one with that one*. For (this) can be understood in a twofold manner: either[6] insofar as it means a *conjunction* of the two: and in this manner of necessity (equality) is attended according to conversion; for if this one goes with that one, it is also necessary, that it be true the other way around. In another manner *this one with that one* means an *association*, and thus a certain subauthority in the one accompanying [associante], and in this manner it is said, that a soldier goes with a king, and not the other way around, because a soldier accompanies [associat] a king,[7] and not the other way around. Similarly must it be understood in "equality".

1. 2. 3. 4. And from these the authorities of the Saints are clear, because[8] they speak of "equality" in the second manner, except that of (St.) Dionysius, to which it must be

locum in proposito, quia Dionysius loquitur proprie de causa, secundum quod causa dicitur illud cuius esse sequitur aliud,[9] et ita differt per essentiam ab effectu, et hoc modo non cadit in Deo respectu personae.

responded, that it has no place in the proposed, because (St.) Dionysius speaks properly of "cause", according to which a cause is said (to be) that of which there follows another "being",[9] and thus it differs through (its) essence from (its) effect, and in this manner it does not occur in God in respect to a Person.

## SCHOLION.

I. Aequalitas *conversim dicta* idem est ac mutua sive reciproca. — Distinctionem inter *simplicem* relationem aequalitatis et aequalitatem cum actu *coaequationis* Sanctus adhibet etiam infra d. 31. p. I. q. 3. Eandem habet etiam S. Thom. et Alex. Hal. locis infra citt. et etiam Richard., qui ad mentem S. Thom. quoad aequalitatem cum actu coaequationis addit: « Sed quia de virtute sermonis hoc nomen *aequale* non dicetur importare nisi relationem *aequiparantiae*, quia quod importet *coaequationem* videtur magis ex modo loquendi, secundum quem non consuevimus proprie dicere veritatem: rex est cum milite, sed miles est cum rege; ideo de virtute sermonis, nisi essent auctoritates, quae videntur sonare ad contrarium, videretur posse concedi simpliciter, quod Pater est aequalis Filio ».

II. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 54. m.1. a. 2. 3. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 2; S. I. q. 42. a. 1. ad 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 4; S. p. I. tr. 11. q. 47. m. 3. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 3. — Richard. a Med., hic. a. 1. q. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 2. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 68. q. 2.

## SCHOLIUM

I. "Equality *conversely said*" is the same as mutual or reciprocal (equality). — The Saint also employs the distinction between a *simple* relation of equality and equality with the act of *co-equation* below in d. 31, p. I, q. 3. St. Thomas and Alexander of Hales have the same (distinction), loc. citt., below, and even Richard (of Middleton), who to the mind of St. Thomas in regard to the equality with the act of co-equation adds: « But because from the virtue of the expression this name "*equal*" would not be said to convey but a relation of *equiparancy*, because what conveys a *co-equation* seems (to be) more from the manner of speaking, according to which we are not accustomed to speak the truth properly: 'a king is with a soldier, but a soldier is with a king'; for that reason from the virtue of the expression, if there were not authorities, which seem to argue for the contrary, it would seem possible that there be conceded simply, that the Father is equal to the Son ».

II. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 54, m.1, a. 2 and 3. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 2; Summa. , I, q. 42, a. 1, in reply to n. 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus)., here in a. 4; Summa., p. I, tr. 11, q. 47, m. 3. — Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 3. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, q. 2. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st. princ., q. 2. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 68, q. 2.

---

[1] Sequimur codd. I Z addendo *cum conversione*, quia de hoc S. Doctor principaliter quaestionem instituit, quod tamen in aliis mss. et Vat. nec non ed. 1 perperam deest. Cod. H (primitus) et K *reciproca* pro *cum conversione*; cod. T (in marg. a posteriore manu) *reciproca sive cum conversione*. Mox post *quia aequalitas* fide mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 expunximus *et cum aequalitas*, quo addito subnexa perturbentur necesse est.

[2] Supplevimus ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 *Et*, et paulo infra post *Pater* fide mss. et sex primarum edd. adiecimus *est*. Plures codd. ut F M T Z aa bb ee *concedendum* loco *credendum*.

[1] We follow codices I and Z by adding *with conversion* [cum conversione], because the Seraphic Doctor established this question principally concerning this, which however is lacking faultily in the other manuscripts and in the Vatican edition, and also in edition 1. Codex H (primitive) and K have *reciprocal equality* [aequalitas reciproca] for *equality with conversion* [aequalitas cum conversione]: codex Y (in the margin by a later hand) has *reciprocal equality or (one) one with conversion* [reciproca sive cum conversione]. Next after *because equality* [quia aequalitas], we have, trusting in the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3, expunged *and when equality* [et

[3] In cod. V additur *est*.
[4] Passivo modo sumtum.
[5] Lectio mss. et sex primarum edd. *quia importat auctoritatem in Patre* contextui repugnat. Mox plures codd. ut A B C D L O R S U Y Z *proprie* loco *perfecte*. Paulo infra Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis codd. cum ed. 1 obnitentibus, incongrue addit *sic* post *Et*. Dein in cod. T a manu suppari in margine post *cum illo* adiungitur *vadit*, forsan propter subnexa; in qua lectione melius *hic* poneretur pro *hoc*.
[6] Plures codd. ut A C F L O R S T W etc. omittunt *aut*, pro quo cod. U habet *scilicet*.
[7] Id est, se socium adiungit regi. Cfr. Robertus, Thesaurus linguae lat. voc. *associare*. — In Vat. et cod. cc male desunt verba *quia miles* usque *e converso*, quae tamen exstant in antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1. Mox, mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 consentientibus, substituimus *in* loco *cum*.
[8] Codd. dissentiunt inter se; alii ut F G H ee cum ed. 1 exhibent lectionem in textum receptam; alii ut A I K S T W Y ff ponunt *qui*, Vat. *quae* loco *quia*.
[9] Cfr. supra pag. 120. nota 7.

cum aequalitas], which when added it is necessary that the subjoined (argument) be perturbed.
[2] Se have supplied from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 *And* [Et], and a little below this after *the Father* [Pater], trusting in the manuscripts and the six first editions, we have inserted *is* [est].
[3] In codex V there is added explicity *it must be* [est].
[4] Taken in the passive mood. [Trans. note: i.e. as *being made co-eequivalent*.]
[5] The reading of the manuscripts and the six first editions *because it conveys authorship in the Father* [quia importat auctoritatem in Patre] is repugnant to the context. Next very many codices, such as A B C D L O R S U Y Z, have *properly* [proprie] in place of *perfectly* [perfecte]. A little below this the Vatican edition, together with codex cc, with the other codices together with edition 1 striving against this, incongruously adds *so* [sic] after *And* [Et]. Then in codex T by an almost equal hand there is added in the margin *goes* [vadit] to the phrase *this one with that one* [hoc cum illo], perhaps on account of the subjoined; in which reading it would have been better to have the masculine form for *this one* [hic] rather than the neuter form.
[6] Very many codices, such as A C F L O R S T W etc., omit *either* [aut], in place of which codex U has *that is* [scilicet].
[7] That is, joins himself as a companion to the king. Cf. Robert's, Thesaurus linguae latinae, under the verb "associare". — In the Vatican edition and codex cc there are badly lacking the words *because a soldier* etc. [quia miles etc.] right up to the end of the sentence, which words are however extant in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1. Next, with the agreement of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3, we have substituted *in* [in] in place of *with* [cum], here at the end of the last sentence.
[8] The Codices disagree among themselves; some, such as F G H and ee together with edition 1, exhibit the reading received in the text; others, such as A I K S T W Y and ff, put *who* [qui] and the Vatican *which* [quae] in place of *because they* [quia].
[9] Cf. above p. 120, footnote 7.

---



S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
*S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae*
*atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis*

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
*Cardinal Bishop of Alba*
*& Doctor of the Church*

# Commentaria in Quatuor Libros

# Commentaries on the Four Books of

# Sententiarum

*Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis*

**PRIMI LIBRI**

## COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIX.

**PARS I.**

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

**Quaestio IV.**

**Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 347-350.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

**QUAESTIO IV.**

*Utrum in divinis sit aequalitas cum circumincessione.*

QUARTO QUAERITUR, utrum in divinis sit aequalitas cum circumincessione. Et quod sic, ostenditur:

1. Primo *auctoritate* Domini, Ioannis decimo quarto:[10] *Ego in Patre, et Pater in me est*.

2. Item, Augustinus de Fide ad Petrum:[11] « Propter unitatem naturae totus Pater est in Filio et Spiritu sancto ».

3. Item, hoc ipsum ostenditur *ratione*, quia in . . .

[10] Vers. 10. et 11.
[11] Cap. 1. n. 4. Vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 4.

# Sentences

*of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris*

**BOOK ONE**

## COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIX

**PART I**

ARTICLE SOLE

**Question 4**

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 347-350.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

**QUESTION 4**

*Whether among the divine there is an equality with circumincession.*

THIRD THERE IS ASKED, whether among the divine there is equality with circumincession. And that (it is) so, is shown:

1. First *by the authority* of the Lord, in the fourteenth (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John:[10] *I (am) in the Father, and the Father is in Me*.

2. Likewise, (by what St.) Augustine (says) On the Faith to Peter:[11] « On account of a unity of nature the whole Father is the in the Son and the Holy Spirit ».

3. Likewise, this very (thing) is shown *by reason*, because in . . .

[10] Verses 10-11.
[11] Chapter 1, n. 4. See here in the text of Master (Peter), ch. 4.

***p. 348***

quocumque est substantia vel essentia Patris, est Pater; sed substantia Patris est in Filio: ergo Pater est in Filio,[1] eadem ratione est Filius in Patre.

4. Item, omne cognitum est in cognoscente vel per veritatem, vel per similitudinem: sed Pater cognoscit Filium quantum ad hypostasim et proprietatem: ergo Filius est

whomsoever is the Substance and/or Essence of the Father, there is the Father; but the Substance of the Father is in the Son: therefore the Father is in the Son,[1] for the same reason the Son is in the Father.

4. Likewise, every cognized is in the one cognized either through truth, and/or through a similitude: but the Father cognizes the Son as much as regards

in Patre: aut ergo[2] quantum ad *veritatem*, aut quantum ad similitudinem *veritatis*. Non quantum ad *similitudinem*, quia tunc esset Filius in Patre sicut creatura: ergo quantum ad *veritatem*; eadem ratione et[3] Pater in Filio: ergo circumincessio est ibi.

Hypostasis and property: therefore the Son is in the Father: therefore either[2] as much as regards *truth*, or as much as regards a similitude *of the truth*. Not as much as regards a *similitude*, because then the Son would be in the Father just as a creature (is): therefore as much as regards *truth*; for the same reason the Father (is) also[3] in the Son: therefore there is a circumincession There.

5. Item, omne quod est comparatum ad alterum, aut est *in* illo, aut *extra* illum. Si ergo Filius comparatur ad Patrem, aut est *in* illo, aut *extra*. Si *in* eo, eadem ratione et Pater in eo; si *extra* eum; sed illa, quorum unum est extra alterum, differunt per substantiam: ergo Pater et Filius substantialiter differunt.

5. Likewise, everything which has been compared to the other, either is *in* it, or *outside of* it. If, therefore, the Son is compared to the Father, either He is *in* Him, or *outside*. If *in* Him, for the same reason the Father (is) also in Him; if *outside of* Him; but those, of which one is outside the other, differ through substance: therefore the Father and the Son substantially differ.

6. Item, maior est convenientia in divinis, quam sit generis ad species vel totius ad partes; sed propter convenientiam generis ad species genus est in speciebus et e converso; et similiter totum in partibus et e converso:[4] ergo multo fortius in divinis Pater est in Filio et e converso.

6. Likewise, there is a greater fittingness [convenientia] among the divine, than is of a genus to (its) species and/or of a whole to (its) parts; but on account of the fittingness of a genus to (its) species a genus is in the species and vice versa [e converso]; and similarly the whole in the parts and vice versa:[4] therefore much more strongly among the divine is the Father in the Son and vice versa.

**Contra:** 1. Si Pater est in Filio et e converso, ergo Pater est in Patre. Sicut enim sequitur in praedicando, quod quidquid praedicatur in plus vel aeque de aliquod, praedicatur de omni eo quod est sub eo:[5] ergo similiter, si aliquid est in aliquo, necesse est, quod in eodem sit omne quod est in eo: ergo si Filius est in Patre, omne quod est in Filio, est in Patre: sed Pater est in Filio: ergo Pater est in Patre.

**On the contrary:** 1. If the Father is in the Son and vice versa, therefore the Father is in the Father. For just as it follows in predicating, that whatever is predicated in more and/or equally of anything, is predicated of every 'that' which is under it:[5] therefore similarly, if anything is in anything, it is necessary, that in the same there be everything which is in that: therefore if the Son is in the Father, everything which is in the Son, is in the Father: but the Father is in the Son: therefore the Father is in the Father.

2. Item, quandocumque duo simplicia eiusdem generis simul sunt, ita quod unum est in altero, non distinguuntur ab invicem, sicut punctus est in puncto. Si ergo Pater et Filius sunt omnino simplices; si Pater est in Filio et Filius in Patre, non videtur quod distinguantur.

2. Likewise, whensoever two simples of the same genus are together, such that one is in the other, they are not distinguished from one another, just as a point is in a point. If, therefore the Father and the Son are entirely simple; if the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father, it does not seem that They are distinguished.

3. Item, si duae essentiae divinae essent, impossibile esset, quod una esset in alia, quia una non posset illabi alii, quoniam

3. Likewise, if there were two Divine Essences, it would be impossible, that One would be in the Other, because One could

utraque esset aeque spiritualis et summe spiritualis: ergo si duae personae sunt aeque et summe sprituales, impossibile est, quod una sit in altera; et illud[6] videtur, quia Deus non potest esse in creatura, quin ei illabatur. Si ergo persona est in persona, videtur omnino ei illabi.

not glide into [illabi] the Other, since Each would be equally spiritual and most highly spiritual: therefore if Two Persons are equally and most highly spiritual, it is impossible, that One be in the Other; and that[6] seems, because God cannot be in a creature, unless He glides into it. If, therefore, a Person is in a Person, it seems that He has entirely glided into Him.

4. Item, quaero, quid significet hoc quod est *esse in Patre*, utrum dicatur secundum *substantiam*, aut secundum *relationem*. Si secundum *relationem*, hoc est contra Augustinum, qui dicit in littera,[7] quod « propter unitatem naturae totus Pater est in Filio et Spiritu sancto ». Si secundum *substantiam*; sed[8] quae secundum substantiam dicuntur, conveniunt tribus: ergo hoc quod est *esse in Patre* convenit Filio et Spiritui sancto et Patri: ergo Pater est in Patre, quod non conceditur.

4. Likewise, I ask, what does that which it is "*to be in the Father*" signify, whether it be said according to *substance*, or according to *relation*. If according to *relation*, this is against to (St.) Augustine, who says in the text,[7] that « on account of the unity of nature the whole Father is in the Son and in the Holy Spirit ». If according to *substance*; but[8] what are said according to the Substance, befit the Three: therefore that which it is "*to be in the Father*" befits the Son and the Holy Spirit and the Father: therefore the Father is in the Father, which is not conceded.

5. Item, cum dicitur: Pater est in Filio, et Filius in Patre, aut importatur *eadem* habitudo, aut *altera*. Si eadem, cum Filius sit in Patre ut in principio, tunc similiter Pater esset[9] in Filio ut in principio; quod simpliciter est absurdum. Si non importatur eadem habitudo: ergo sicut[10] non est circumincessio, cum dicitur: genus est in species, et species in genere, similiter nec in proposito esset circumincessio.

5. Likewise, when there is said. 'the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father', either there is conveyed the *same* habitude, or *another*. If the same, since the Son is in the Father as in a principle, then similarly the Father would be[9] in the Son as in a principle; which is simply absurd. If there is not conveyed the same habitude: therefore just as[10] there is not a circumincession, when there is said: 'a genus is in (its) species, and a species in (its) genus', there would in the proposed similarly be neither a circumincession.

6. Item, Filius est de Patre et apud Patrem, et non convertitur: ergo pari ratione videtur, quod non convertatur, quodsi Pater est in Filio, quod Filius sit in Patre.

6. Likewise, 'the Son is from [de] the Father and with [apud] the Father', and (this) is not convertible [convertitur]: therefore for an equal reason it seems, that (this) is not convertible, 'that if the Father is in the Son, that the Son is in the Father'.

7. Item, novem modi essendi *in*[11] sunt in crea- / -turis.

7. Likewise, there are nine manners of being "*in*"[11] among crea- / -tures.

---

[1] Unus laterque codex ut G V addit *ergo*.
[2] In Vat. omissum *ergo* supplevimus ex mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3.
[3] Ope antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 restituimus particulam *et*. Cod. Z post *Pater* adiungit *est*.
[4] Cfr. Aristot., IV. Phys. text. 23. (c. 3.). Vide infra arg. 7. ad opp. — Verba *et similiter* usque *e converso* desiderantur in Vat. et cod. cc, quae tamen in ceteris mss. et ed. 1 inveniuntur.
[5] Aristot., de Praedicam. c. de Denominativis in fine: Quando alterum de altero praedicatur ut de subiecto,

---

[1] One or the other codex, such as G and V, adds *therefore* [ergo].
[2] In the Vatican edition, we have supplied the omitted *therefore* [ergo], from the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3.
[3] With the help of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have restored the particle *also* [et].
[4] Cf. Aristotle, Physics, Bk. VI, text 23 (ch. 3). See below in the 7th argument of the Contrary. — The words *and similarly* etc. [et similiter etc.]up to the end of the clause are wanting in the Vatican edition

quaecumque de eo quod praedicatur dicuntur, omnia etiam de subiecto dicentur. Haec propositio innuit principium affirmativi syllogismi, quod vocatur *dici de omni*. Vide Aristot., I. Prior. c. 1. seqq. — Aristot., II. Poster. c. 14. (c. 12.) ait: « Dico autem *in plus esse* quaecumque insunt quidem unicuique universaliter, at vero et alii ». Haec sunt, ut ibi innuitur, duplicis rationis; quaedam sunt ita *in plus*, ut *sint etiam extra genus*, ut sunt conceptus primi analogi v. g. *esse aliquid* respectu ternarii; quaedam vero sunt ita *in plus*, ut tamen *non sint extra genus*, cuiusmodi sunt conceptus univoci generici v. g. *esse numerum imparem* respectu ternarii. Porphyrius libr. de Praedicab. ponit *superabundat* loco *est in plus*. Hinc verbis *quidquid praedicatur in plus vel aeque* intellige praedicatum, quod vel est maioris extensionis v. g. genus, vel eiusdem extensionis ac subiectum v. g. genus cum differentia specifica et proprium. Cfr. Boeth., Dialogus I. in Porphyr., c. de Genere.

[6] Vat. *ita* loco *illud*, sed contra mss., quorum tamen plures ponut *istud*, et ed. 1 cum uno alterove codice ut X *per illud*. Mox substituendo *quia Deus non potest* pro ambiguo *quod Deus non possit* exhibemus lectionem cod. T, cum qua et codd. H Z et ed. 1 conveniunt in eo, quod habent *patet* loco *possit*, cod. K retento *possit*, substituit *cum* pro *quod*; cod. H *per hoc quod*. — Paulo ante cod. A *divinae* loco *duae*, et Vat. contra cod. T aliosque cum ed. 1 *sint* pro *sunt*.

[7] Hic, c. 4.

[8] Fide multorum mss. ut A H K M S T W X Y Z etc. et edd. 1, 2, 3 supplevimus *sed*, quod minus bene abest a Vat. — Mox post *substantiam* in cod. X additur *de Deo*.

[9] Ed. 1 *erit*. Paulo post in plurimis antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 perperam *similiter* pro *simpliciter*.

[10] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et sex primarum edd. *si* pro *sicut*, et paulo ante contra plurimos codd. *importatur altera* pro *non importatur eadem*.

[11] In multis mss. sicut et in ed. 1 ac Vat. deest praepositio *in*, sed male et contra codd. H M Y ff. — Octo horum modorum ponuntur ab Aristot., IV. Phys. text. 23. (c. 3.), et nonum addit, ut S. Doctor paulo infra dicit, Boethius, I. in Categor. seu Pradicam. Aristot. c. de Denominativis.

and in codex cc, but are found in all the other manuscripts and in edition 1.

[5] Aristotle, On the Predicaments, ch. "On Denominatives", at the end (says): When one is predicated of another, as of a subject, whatsoever of that which is predicated, are predicated, all are said also of the subject. This proposition hints at the principle of the affirmative syllogism, which is called *dici de omni* ["being said of all"]. See Aristotle, Prior Analytics, Bk. I, ch. 1 ff. — Aristotle, Posterior Analytics, Bk. II, ch. 14 (ch. 12) says: « But I say that whatsoever "*are in more*" are indeed in each one universally, but, however, (are) also other ». These belong, as is hinted at there, to a twofold reckoning; certain ones are so *in more*, as *to be also outside of the genus*, as are the concepts of first analogy, v. g. "*to be something* in respect of a third"; but certain ones are so *in more*, as yet *not to be outside of the genus*, of which kind are the concepts of a generic univocal, v. g. "*to be an odd number* in respect to a third". Porphyry in his book On the Predicables has *super-abounds* [superabundat] in place of *is in more* [est in plus]. Hence understand by the words *whatever is predicated in more and/or equally* [quidquid praedicatur in plus vel aeque] a predicated, which either is of a greater extension, v. g. a genus, and/or of the same extension ad the subject, v. g. a genus with a specific difference and proper (genus). Cf. (St. Severinus) Boethius, First Dialogue on Porphyry, ch. "on Genus"

[6] The Vatican edition has *thus it* [ita] on place of *that* [illud], but contrary to the manuscripts, yet very many of them put *that* [istud], and edition 1 together with one or the other codex, such as I, puts *through that* [per illud]. Next by substituting *because God cannot* [quia Deus non potest] for the ambiguous *that God cannot* [quod Deus non possit], we exhibit the reading of codex T, together with which codices H and Z and edition 1 also agree in this, that they have patent for potest, codex K, having retained the subjunctive form *can* [possit], substituted *since* [cum] for *that* [quod]; codex H reads *through this that* [per hoc quod] for *because* [quia]. — A little before this codex A has *the Divine* [divinae] for *Two* [duae], and the Vatican edition, contrary to codex T and the others together with edition 1, reads *be* [sint] for the *are* [sunt], which follows this.

[7] Here in ch. 4.

[8] Trusting in many manuscripts, such as A H K M S T W X Y Z etc., and editions 1, 2, and 3, we have supplied *but* [sed], which less well is absent form the Vatican edition. — Next after *Substance* [substantiam] in codex X there is added *of God* [de Deo].

[9] Edition 1 reads *will be* [erit]. A little after this in very many of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, there is faultily had *similarly* [similiter] for *simply* [simpliciter].

[10] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and the six first editions, reads *if* [si] for *just as* [sicut], and a little before this, contrary to very many codices, has *there is conveyed the other* [importatur altera] for *there is not conveyed the same* [non importatur eadem].

[11] In many manuscripts, just as also in edition 1 and the Vatican edition, there is lacking the preposition *in* [in], but badly and contrary to codices H M Y and ff. — Eight of these manners are posited by Aristotle, Physics, Bk. IV, text 23 (ch. 3), and the ninth, as the Seraphic Doctor says a little below this, (St. Severinus) Boethius adds, On the Categories or Predicaments of Aristotle, Bk. I, ch. "on Denominatives".



crea- / -turis. Primo modo sicut pars in toto; secundo modo sicut totum in partibus; tertio modo sicut species in genere; quarto modo sicut genus in speciebus; quinto modo sicut forma in materia; sexto modo sicut rectum sive motum in regente; septimo modo sicut res in suo fine; octavo modo sicut contentum in continente; et nonum addit Boethius, scilicet[1] sicut accidens in subiecto. Quaeritur ergo, quo istorum modorum sit Pater in Filio et e converso; et cum nullum horum sit dare, videtur quod nullo modo sit.

crea- / -tures. In the first manner, just as a part in the whole; in the second manner just as a whole in (its) parts; in the third manner just as a species in a genus; in the fourth manner just as a genus in (its) species; in the fifth manner just as a form in matter; in the sixth manner just as one ruled or moved in one ruling; in the seventh manner just as a thing in its end; in the eighth manner just as one contained in one containing; and the ninth (St. Severinus) Boethius adds, namely,[1] just as an accident in a subject. There is asked, therefore, by which of these manners is the Father in the Son and vice versa; and since it is that one grants none of these, it seems that He is in no manner (in the Son).

**CONCLUSIO.**

*In divinis personis est summa et perfecta circumincessio ratione unitatis essentiae cum distinctione personarum.*

**CONCLUSION**

*Among the Divine Persons there is a most high and perfect circumincession by reason of a unity of essence with a distinction of persons.*

**Respondeo:** Dicendum, quod,[2] sicut auctoritates probant et rationes, in divnis est summa et perfecta *circumincessio*. Et haec vocatur[3] *circumincessio*, qua dicitur, quod unus est in alio et e converso; et hoc proprie et prefecte in solo Deo est, quia circumincessio in essendo ponit distinctionem simul et unitatem. Et quoniam in solo Deo est summa[4] unitas cum distinctione, ita quod distinctio est inconfusa et unitas indistincta: hinc est, quod in solo Deo est circumincessio perfecta. Et patet ratio huius, quia ratio circumincessionis est perfecta unitas essentiae cum distinctione personarum. Et quoniam hoc est proprium solius Dei, ideo et circumincessio talis, secundum quod dicit Hilarius et Magister inducit in littera.[5]

**I respond:** It must be said, that,[2] just as the authorities and reason prove, there is among the divine a most high and perfect *circumincession*. And this is called[3] a *circumincession*, by which there is meant, that One is in the Other and vice versa: and this properly and perfectly is in God alone, because circumincession in being [in essendo] posits simultaneously a distinction and a unity. And since in God alone there is a most high[4] unity with a distinction, such that the distinction is unconfused and the unity indistinct: hence it is, that in God alone is there a perfect circumincession. And the reason for this is clear, because the reason for circumincession is the perfect Unity of the Essence with a distinction of the Persons. And since this is proper to God alone, for that reason too (is) the circumincession such, according to which

(St.) Hilary says and Master (Peter) brings forward in the text.[5]

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur, quod Pater in Filio et Filius in Patre, ergo Pater[6] in se; dicunt quidam, quod argumentum non valet, quia mutatur habitudo eius quod est *in*; quia in una dicit habitudinem principiati ad principium, in alia autem habitudnem principii ad principiatum. Tamen illud non oportet dicere, quia sicut iam patebit,[7] *in* non dicit diversam habitudinem. Nec tamen sequitur, immo est accidens ibi, eo quod *in* notat distinctionem, sicut accidens est hic: Petrus est similis Paulo, et Paulus Petro: ergo Petrus est similis Petro; ita et in proposito intelligendum.

1. To that, therefore, which is objected, that the Father (is) in the Son and the Son in the Father, therefore the Father[6] (is) in Himself, certain ones say, that the argument is not valid, because the habitude of that what is "*in*" is changed, because in One it means the habitude of the begun to the beginning, but in the other the habitude of the beginning to the begun. However one is not bound to say that, because just as will soon be clear,[7] "*in*" does not mean a diverse habitude. Nor yet does it follow, nay it is an accident There, for this because "*in*" notes a distinction, just as the accident is here: 'Peter is similar to Paul, and Paul to Peter: therefore Peter is similar to Peter'; thus also must it be understood in the proposed.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod[8] simplicia simul existentia confunduntur in unum; dicendum, quod illud verum est, quando simplicia habent distingui penes *illud*, in quo sunt, sicut punctus et unitas ab eo, in quo est. Sed quando *se ipsis* distinguuntur et in[9] se ipsis substantificantur, tunc, quamvis sint simul, non confunduntur; et tales sunt hypostases divinae. Et huius simile, quamvis perfecte non possit in creatura inveniri, tamen Dionysius[10] ponit exemplum in luminibus, quae multa sunt in eodem aëre inconfusa; et huius signum est, quia, quando luminare aufertur, secum[11] trahit lumen suum, nihil de aliis convellens. Et ratio huius est, quia lumina in aëre non distinguuntur penes id *in quo*.[12]

2. To that which is objected, that[8] simples existing together are confounded as one [in unum]; it must be said, that that is true, when the simples have to be distinguished from within *that*, in which they are, just as a point and a unity from that, in which it is. But when they are distinguished *by their very selves* and in[9] their very selves are substantiated [substantificantur], then, although they be together, they are not confounded; and such are the Divine Hypostases. And although it cannot be perfectly found in a creature, (St.) Dionysius[10] posits a similar example of this in lights, which are many (and yet) unconfused in the same air; and it is a sign of this (Unity in Trinity), because, when one luminous source [luminare] is taken away, it draws with itself[11] its own light, pulling nothing away from the others. And the reason for this is, that lights in the air are not distinguished from within that *in which* (they are).[12]

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod essentia non est in essentia nisi per illapsum etc.; dicendum, quod non est simile, quia ubi est essentiarum diversitas, si una est in altera, oportet quod una sit aliquo modo materialis alteri; sed quando[13] personae differunt, salva essentiae unitate, una est in alia, quia essentia unius est essentia alterius, et ita, sicut idem non illabitur sibi, ita nullus potest esse ibi illapsus.

3. To that which is objected, that an essence is not in an essence except through gliding into it etc.; it must be said, that it is not similar, because where there is a diversity of essences, if one is in the other, it is necessary [oportet] that one in some manner be material to the other; but when[13] persons differ, conserving [salva] a unity of essence, one is in the other, because the essence of one is the essence of the other, and thus, just as the same (thing) does not glide into itself, so there can be no gliding-in

4. Ad illud quod quaeritur, quid significet hoc quod est *esse in Patre*; dicendum, quod, sicut Sancti innuunt, sicut *aequale* dicit respectum secundum unitatem quanitatis, et *simile* secundum unitatem qualitatis,[14] similiter hoc quod est *esse in Patre*, secundum unitatem substantiae. Unde sicut *aequale* . . .

There.

4. To that which is objected, what does that which it is "*to be in the Father*" signify; it must be said, that, just as the Saint hint at, just as "*equal*" means a looking-back according to the unity of quantity; and "*similar*" according to a unity of[14] quality, similarly that which it is "*to be in the Father*", (means a looking-back) according to a unity of substance. Whence, just as "*equal*" . . .

---

[1] Plures codd. ut A F G I S T V X Y etc. *quia*, et pauci ut H Z cum ed. 1 *quod* loco *scilicet*. Mox fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *modorum*, deinde substituimus *nullum horum* pro *nullo illorum*.
[2] Vat. contra plurimos codd. et ed. 1 *quia*, sed minus apte.
[3] Respectu huius propositionis magna diversitas in codd. invenitur; sic loco *haec*, quod a pluribus mss. ut I S T aa cc et ed. 1 exhibetur, alii ut K X Z bb ponut cum Vat. *hic*, cod. O *hoc*; dein aliqui tantum codd. et Vat. *notatur* pro *vocatur*; codd. A R T verba *Et haec vocatur circumincessio* omittunt. Mox pauci codd. ut K O *quia* loco *qua*, et demum paulo infra cod. T *haec* pro *hoc*.
[4] Praestamus antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 lectionem addendo *summa*, quod et rei veritas exigit.
[5] Hic. c. 4. — Plures codd. ut A F G H Z cum ed. 1 *adducit* loco *inducit*.
[6] Vat. contra plurimos mss. et ed. 1 addit hic et paulo ante post *Pater* verbum *est*.
[7] Infra ad 5; cfr. etiam dub. 6.
[8] Ex antiquioribus codd. et ed. 1 supplevimus *quod*.
[9] Codd. V X *ita* pro *in*.
[10] De Div. Nom. c. 2. § 4: Et enim videmus in domo, multis unitis lampadibus, ad unum aliquod lumen unita omnium omnia lumina et unam claritatem indiscretam relucentem, et non etiam quis, ut arbitror, poterit alicuius lamapdis lumen ab aliis ex omnia lumina contienti aëre discernere, et videre sine altera parte alteram partem, totis in totis inconfuse contemperatis. Sed si etiam unam quis ardentium subduxerit domi, coibit et proprium totum lumen, nullum quiddam aliorum luminum in semetipsa complectens, aut suimet alteris relinquens. Erat enim eorum, quod quidem dixi, omnium ad omnia perfectissima unitas, incommixta universaliter, et nulla parte confusa: et haec, existente in corpore aëre, et ex materiali igne pendente lumine.
[11] In Vat. praeter fidem mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 deest *secum*.
[12] Cod. Y addit *sunt*; codd. vero B D H adiiciunt *sed penes suas origines*, a quibus cod. O in eo tantum discedit, quod loco *penes* habet *per*.
[13] Vat. perperam et contra mss. nec non sex primas edd. *quoniam*.
[14] In cod. O additur *essentialis vel substantialis*, et paulo ante cum nomine *quantitatis* coniungitur *virtualis*. Mox post *in Patre* cod. G adiungit *est*, sed melius suppletur *dicit respectum*.

---

[1] Very many codices, such as A F G I S T V X Y etc., read *because* [quia] for *namely* [scilicet] and a few, such as H and Z, together with edition 1, have *which (is)* [quod] in place of the same. Next trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *manners* [modorum], and then we have substituted *none of these* [nullum horum] for *in none of those* [nullo illorum].
[2] The Vatican edition, contrary to very many codices and edition 1, reads *because* [quia], but less aptly.
[3] In regard to this proposition a great diversity is found among the codices; thus in place of *this* [haec], which is exhibited by very many manuscripts, such as I S T aa and cc, and by edition 1, others, such as K X Z and bb, put with the Vatican edition *here* [hic], codex O *this (concept)* [hoc]; then only some codices and the Vatican edition read *is noted* [notatur] for *is called* [vocatur]; codices A R and T omit the words *And this is called circumincession* [Et haec vocatur circumincessio]. Next a few codices, such as K and O, read *because* [quia] in place of *by which* [qua], and then a little below this codex T has *this (circumincession)* [haec] for *this (concept, that 'One is in the other etc.')* [hoc].
[4] We offer the reading of the more ancient manuscripts and of edition 1, by adding *most high* [summa], which the truth of the matter also requires.
[5] Here in ch. 4. — Very many codices, such as A F G H and Z, together with edition 1, read *adduces* [adducit] in place of *brings forward* [inducit].
[6] The Vatican edition, contrary to very many manuscripts and edition 1, adds here and a little before this, after *the Father* [Pater] the verb *is* [est].
[7] Below in reply to n. 5; cf. also dubium 6.
[8] From the more ancient codices and edition 1, we have supplied *that* [quod].
[9] Codices V and X read *thus by their very selves* [ita se ipsis] for *in their very selves* [in se ipsis].
[10] On the Divine Names, ch. 2, § 4: For we also see in a house, with many united lamps, that the lights of all (have been) united to any one light and (that there is) one indiscrete glowing brightness, and that even no one, as I judge, could discern the light of any lamp from the others out of the air containing all the lights, and see without one part the other part, with all mixed properly together [contemperatis] in all, in an unconfused manner. But if anyone will have taken one of the burning (lamps) from the house, with it goes also the whole of its own light [proprium totum lumen], comprising nothing of the other lights,

and leaving nothing of itself to the others. For there was of them, what indeed I said, a most perfect unity of all to all, universally un-commingled, and confused in no part: and this, existing in the body "air", and from a light depending on material fire.

[11] In the Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3, there is lacking *with itself* [secum].

[12] Codex Y adds *they are* [sunt]; but codices B D and H add *but from within their own origins* [sed penes suas origines], from which codex I differs only in this, that in place of *from within* [penes] it has *through* [per].

[13] The Vatican edition faultily, and contrary to the manuscripts and also to the six first editions, reads *since* [quoniam].

[14] In codex O there is added *essential and/or substantial* [essentialis vel substantialis], and a little before this to the name *of quantity* [quantitatis] there is conjoined *of virtue* [virtualis]. Next after *in the Father* [in Patre], codex G adds *is* [est], but it would be better to supply *means a looking-back* [dicit respectum].

---

## *p. 350*

simul importat substantiam cum relatione, sicut patebit infra,[1] ita et hoc quod est *esse in*. Et sicut, cum dicitur *aequalis Patri*, arctatur ad standum pro aliis personis, ita et in propositio intelligendum.

simultaneously conveys substance with relation, just as will be clear below,[1] so also that which it is "*to be in*". And just as, when there is said "*equal to the Father*", it is constrained to stand for the other Persons, so also must it be understood in the proposed.

5. Ad illud quod quaeritur, utrum importetur eadem habitudo; dicendum sine praeiudicio, quod *sic*, quantum est de ratione nominis. Sicut enim, cum dicitur: Pater est similis Filio et e converso, non importatur alia et alia habitudo; ita nec in hoc quod est *esse in*,[2] quia importat relationem identitatis sive consubstantialitatis. Unde si dicatur: Pater est similis Filio et e converso, non dicitur alia habitudo; sic in proposito, quia significat hoc quod est *esse in Patre* idem quod est *esse Patri consubstantialem*. Et uniformiter accipitur *consubstantialis*, cum dicitur de Patre et Filio. Et hoc patet, quia si non diceret consimilem habitudinem, non esset circumincessio, sicut nec est, quando dicitur creatura esse in Deo, et Deus esse in creatura; quia alia importatur habitudo in utraque.[3]

5. To that which is asked, whether the same habitude would be conveyed; it must be said without prejudice, that *it would be*, as much as concerns the reckoning of the name. For just as, when there is said: 'the Father is similar to the Son and vice versa', there is not conveyed one and another habitude; so neither in that which it is "*to be in*",[2] because it conveys a relation of identity or of consubstantiality. Whence if there be said: 'the Father is similar to the Son and vice versa', another habitude is not meant; so in the proposed, because that which it is "*to be in the Father*" signifies the same (as) that which it is "*to be consubstantial to the Father*". And "*consubstantial*" is accepted in a uniform manner, when it is said of the Father and the Son. And this is clear, because if it did not mean a completely, similar habitude, there would be no circumincession, just as neither is there, when a creature is said to be in God, and God to be in the creature; because differing [alia] habitudes are

conveyed in each (proposition).[3]

6. Ad illud quod quaeritur de hoc quod est *apud* etc.; dicendum, quod quaedam praepositiones important habitudinem *repugnantiae*, ut *contra*; quaedam distantiae, ut hoc quod est *ad* et *propre*; quaedam *causae*, ut *de* et *ex*; quaedem *convenientiae*, ut *in* et *cum*. Primae et secundae nullo modo recipiuntur,[4] sed tertiae et quartae sic, et tertiae non conversim, sed quartae conversim, quia convenientia est relatio aequiparantiae.

6. To that which is asked concerning that which it is "*to be with or from*" etc.; it must be said, that certain prepositions convey a habitude of *repugnance*, as "*against*" [contra]; certain ones (a habitude) of distance, as that which is "*towards*" [ad] and "*near*" [prope]; certain ones (a habitude) of *cause*, as "*from*" [de] and "out of", certain ones (a habitude) *of fittingness*, as "*in*" [in] and "*with*" [cum]. The first and second are in no manner received (among the divine),[4] but the third and fourth are, and the third (are) not conversely (said), but the fourth (are said) conversely, because fittingness is a relation of equiparancy.

7. Ad ultimum solvendum, quod iste est singularis modus essendi *in*, qui non continentur inter illos, nec potest reperiri proprie in creaturis.

7. To the last it must be explained [solvendum], that that (of the Divine Persons) is a singular manner of being "*in*", which is not contained among the others, nor can be found properly among creatures.

## SCHOLION.

I. *Circumincessio* (□□□□□□□□□□□) per duplicem praepositionem (*circum-in*) aliquo modo exprimit duplicem sensum vocabuli Graeci, scilicet *invadere* et *capere*. Nostris temporibus saepe vocatur *circuminsessio*, quod vocabulum tamen minus aptum esse videtur, ut profundus sensus vocabuli Graeci exprimatur. Pro intelligentia quaestionis notandum est, quod saltem tria ad circumincessionem requiruntur: nempe inexistentia actualis unius in alio; realis distinctio eorum qui cirucmincedunt; intima eorum praesentia et consubstantialitas. Hinc sequitur, nullam creaturam hoc modo in alia esse posse, nec ipsum Deum proprie circumincessive inesse alicui *creaturae*, sed in solo Deo esse circumincessionem perfectam, ut docet sanctus Doctor in corp. Ceterum sequitur circumincessio, ut bene docet Richard. a Med. (loc. infra cit.), « ex hoc firmissimo fundamento credito, quod in tribus personis una essentia est. Ex quo enim quaelibet persona est in essentia sicut suppositum in natura, et essentia in qualibet persona sicut natura in supposito, sequitur, quamlibet personam per suam essentiam esse in alia, alio tamen modo, quam natura sit in supposito et suppositum in natura » etc., nempe quia requiritur aliqua differentia vel distinctio ad hoc, quod unum sit in alio.

## SCHOLIUM

I. *Circumincession* (□□□□□□□□□□□) through the twofold prefix (circum + in) in some manner expresses the twofold sense of the Greek word, namely "*to go in*" [invadere] and "*to grasp*" [capere]. In our times it is often called *circuminsession* [circuminsessio], which word, however, seems to be less apt, to express the profound sense of the Greek word. For an understanding of this question it must be noted, that at least three (things) are required for circumincession: namely an actual non-existence of one in the other; a real distinction of those who are circumincessing; their most interior presence and consubstantiality. Hence it follows, that no creature can be in this manner in another, nor is God Himself properly in any *creature* in a circumincessive manner, but rather that in God alone there is a prefect circumincession, as the holy Doctor teaches in the body (of the question). Otherwise, as Richard of Middleton (<u>loc</u>. <u>cit</u>. below) teaches, circumincession follows « from this most firmly believed fundament, that among the Three Persons there is one Essence. For from this 'every Person is in the Essence just as a supposit (is) in a nature, and the Essence in is every person just as a nature in a supposit', there follows, that every Person is through His own

Essence in the Other, yet in a manner other, than a nature in in a supposit and a supposit in a nature » etc., namely because there is required some difference and/or distinction for this, that one be in the other.

II. Quoad solut. ad 1. S. Doctor primam responsioinem merito reiicit. Est enim hic fallacia accidentis. *Esse in alio* enim importat distinctionem unius ab alio; *esse in se* vero tollit omnem distinctionem. Fallaciter ergo concluditur: Pater est in Filio, scil. ut distinctus ab eo, et e converso: ergo est in se, cum sit indistinctus omnino. Sic enim fit transitus a distinctione ad identitatem. Exemplum in littera positum rem magis explicat. Sic patet, quod Aristotelica regula: quidquid praedicatur de aliquo etiam de omni, quod sub illo est, praedicatur, in applicatione fallere potest. Richard. a Med. tamen eandem obiectionem aliter solvit.

II. In regard to the solution to n. 1, the Seraphic Doctor meritedly rejects the first response. For here there is a fallacy of the accident. For "*to be in another*" conveys the distinction of one from the other; but "*to be in oneself*" bears off every distinction. Therefore it fallaciously concludes: 'the Father is in the Son, that is, as One distinct from Him, and vice versa: therefore He is in Himself, since He is entirely indistinct'. For in this manner it passes from distinction to identity. The example posited in the text explains the matter more. Thus it is clear, that the Aristotelian Rule: 'whatever is predicated of something, is predicated of all, which are under it', can fail in being applied. Richard of Middleton, however, solves the same objection in another manner.

Quintam obiectionem eodem modo solvit S. Thom. (hic q. 3. a. 2 ad 3; S. I. q. 42. a. 1. ad 4.).

The fifth objection is solved in the same manner by St. Thomas (here in q. 3, a. 2, in reply to n. 3; Summa., I, q. 42, a. 1, in reply to n. 4).

III. In conclusione omnes conveniunt; et S. Thom. in Summa ad probandam conclusionem iisdem tribus argumentis utitur, quae apud S. Bonav. sunt 3. 4. 5. in fundam. — Inepte Durandus et Aureolus hoc 5. argumentum 8quod S. Thomas habet 2. loco) impugare nituntur. — Cfr. Scot., hic. q. 2; Report., hic q. 4. — S. Thom., hic q. 3. a. 2; S. I. q. 42. a. 5; S. c. Gent. IV. c. 9. in fine. — B. Albert., hic a. 8. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 4. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 3. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 2. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 53. q. 10. — Durand., hic a. 3. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 2. — Biel, hic q. 2.

III. In the conclusion all agree; and St, Thomas in his Summa uses the same three arguments to prove the conclusion, which St. Bonaventure has as the 3rd., 4th. and 5th. fundaments. — Durandus and (Peter) Aureolus ineptly strive to impugn the 5th. argument (which St. Thomas has in the 2nd. position). — Cf. (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in. q. 2; Reportatio., here in q. 4. — St. Thomas, here in q. 3, a. 2; Summa., I, q. 42, a. 5; Summa contra Gentiles., Bk. IV, c. 9, at the end. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 8. — Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 4. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 2, q. 3. — Giles the Roman, here in 2nd. princ., q. 2. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 53, q. 10. — Durandus, here in a. 3. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 2. — (Gabriel) Biel, here in q. 2.

---

[1] Dist. 31. p. I. q. 2. — Paulo infra post *quod est* plurimi codd. ut A C G I K L O P Q R S T U W Y etc. cum edd. 1, 2, 3 omittunt *esse*, sed male. Dein fide mss. loco *hoc quod est* substituimus *cum dicitur*, cui codd. O Z adiungunt satis bene *aliqua persona est*.

[2] Multi codd. ut paulo supra cum edd. 1, 2, 3

[1] Distinction 31, p. I, q. 2. — A little below this after *which it is* [quod est] very many codices, such as A C G I K L O P Q R S T U W Y etc, together with editions 1, 2, and 3, omit *to be* [esse], but badly. Then trusting in the manuscripts, we have substituted in place of *that which it is* [hoc quod est] *when there is*

perperam omittunt *esse*. Mox post *Unde* auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 expunximus additum *sicut*, quod tamen multi codd. paulo infra loco *significat* ponunt, et respectu cuius cod. O (cum quo fere convenit cod. I) post *consubstantialem* addit *sic esse in Filio idem est quod esse Filio consubstantialem*, sed ad rem minus congruenter. Aliqui mss. ut V X verbis *in proposito* praefigunt particulam *et*; dein a multis codd. et edd. 1, 2, 3 post *idem quod* omittitur *est*, et a pluribus mss. cum edd. 1, 2, 3 substituitur *Patrem* pro *Patri*.

[3] Supple: propositione; pro qua suppletione elidendi substituit Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 *utroque* pro *utraque*.

[4] Subaudi: in divinis. — Mox Vat., refragantibus mss. et ed. 1, *tertiae sic quod* loco *et tertiae*, pro quo cod. W exhibet *licet tertiae*. In cod. O quartum divisionis membrum subdividitur, in quantum quaedam praepositiones important habitudinem convenientiae *simpliciter*, quaedam *cum subauctoritate* et ultimae *nullo modo reciprocantur*.

*said* [cum dicitur], after which codices O and Z add, sufficiently well, “*some person is* [aliqua persona est].

[2] Many codices, such as those a little above, together with editions 1, 2 and 3, faultily omit *to be* [esse]. Next after *Whence* [Unde], on the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged the added *just as* [sicut], which, however, many codices put a little below this in place of *signifies* [significat], and in regard to which codex O (with which codex I nearly agrees) after *consubstantial to the Father* [Patri consubstantialem] adds *so “to be in the Son the same One which is consubstantial to the Son”* [sic esse in Filio idem est quod esse Filio consubstantialem], but less congruously to the matter. Some manuscripts, such as V and X, to the words *in the proposed* [in proposito] add *also* [et]; then in many codices and editions 1, 2 and 3, after *the same(as) that which* [idem quod] there is omitted *it is* [est], and in very many manuscripts together with editions 1, 2 and 3, there is substituted *there is a consubstantial Father* [esse Patrem consubstantialem] for *to be consubstantial to the Father* [esse Patri consubstantialem].

[3] Supply: proposition; the Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, reads *in each (being)* [utroque] for *in each (proposition)* [utraque].

[4] Understand: among the divine. — Next the Vatican edition, breaking tieht the manuscripts and edition 1, reads *the third in this manner which (is)* [tertiae sic quod] in place of *and the third* [et tertiae], in place of which codex W exhibits *thought the third* [licet tertiae]. In codex O the fourth member of the division is subdivided, inasmuch as certain prepositions convey the habitude of fittingness *simply*, certain ones *with subauthority* and the last *are in no manner reciprocated*. [Trans. note: For the definition of *equiparancy* see d. 19, p. I, a. sole, q. 3, p. 347, footnote 5.]

---

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
*S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae*
*atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis*

# Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

*Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis*

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
*Cardinal Bishop of Alba*
*& Doctor of the Church*

# Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

*of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris*

# COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIX.

# COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIX

## PARS I. DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

## PART I DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

**Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 350-353.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 350-353.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

### Dub. I.

In parte ista sunt dubitationes circa litteram; et primo dubitatur de *situ* huius partis. Cum enim unitas in *substantia* faciat identitatem, unitas in *quantiate* aequalitatem, unitas in *qualitate* similitudinem,[5] pari ratione videtur, quod deberet determinare de identitate et similitudine; quia, si de his non determinat, videtur, quod nec de aequalitate deberet facere specialem tractatum.

### Doubt I

In this part there are doubts about the text (of Master Peter); and first there is a doubt concerning *the place* [situ] of this part. For since unity in *substance* causes identity, unity in *quantity* equality, unity in *quality* similitude, for an equal reason it seems, that he ought to have determined (something) concerning the identity and similitude; because, if he does not determine (anything) concerning these, it seems that neither ought he have written [facere] a special tract on equality.

[5] Vide supra pag. 342. nota 6.

[5] See above p. 342, footnote 6.

*p. 351*

**Respondeo:** Dicendum, quod ostensa perfecta aequalitate, ostenditur, quod omnimoda sit in natura identitas et similitudo; et ideo determinata aequalitate, non est opportunum de aliis determinare; sed magis de aequalitate determinat propter haereses extripandas, Arianorum maxime, qui posuerunt inaequalitatem in divinis; et ideo difficilior[1] et utilior circa hoc versatur disputatio.

I **respond:** It must be said, that with a perfect equality shown, there is shown, that there is an omnimodal identity and similitude in the Nature; and for that reason with the equality determined, it is not opportune to determine (anything) concerning the others; but he determines more concerning equality on account of extirpating heresies, most of all that of the Arians, who posited inequality [inaequalitatem] among the Divine (Persons); and for that reason a more difficult[1] and useful disputation turns about this.

### Dub. II.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *aequalitas consistit in aeternitate*. Videtur enim male procedere, quia ipse dividit coeternitatem[2] contra aequalitatem: ergo si ab ea distinguitur, quantum ad aeternitatem non attenditur aequalitas.

### Doubt II

Likewise is asked of this which he says, that (Their) *equality consists in eternity*. For he seems to proceed badly, because he divides coeternity[2] against equality: therefore if it is distinguished from that, (then) as much as regards eternity (Their) equality is not attained.

**Respondeo:** Dicendum, quod aequalitas perfecta in his tribus consistit, et Magister condividit aequalitatem contra coaeternitatem quantum ad alia duo membra, scilicet magnitudinem et potentiam.

**I respond:** It must be said, that perfect equality consists in these Three, and Master (Peter) co-divides equality against coeternity, as much as regards the other two members (of the division), namely magnitude and power.

## Dub. III.

## Doubt III

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Non alio Deus, alio magnus* etc., quia videtur pari ratione, cum alio sit Deus, alio Pater, quod alio sit Deus, alio magnus. *Si dicas*, quod quantitas transit in substantiam, relatio non; obiicitur, quod illud non solvit. Augustinus[3] enim loquitur de formali praedicatione, et constat, quod formaliter loquendo ita est ista falsa: Deus est magnus deitate, vel Deus magnitudine, sicut et: Pater magnitudine.[4]

Likewise is asked of this which he says: *Not for one (reason) God, for another great* etc., because it seems for an equal reason, since for one (reason) He is God, for another the Father, that by one He is God, by another great. *If you say*, that quantity passes over into the Substance, relation (does) not; it is objected, that does not solve (the matter). For (St.) Augustine[3] speaks of formal predication, and it is established, that formally speaking thus this is false: 'God is great by the Deity, and/or (is) God by (His) magnitude', just as also: '(He is) the Father by (His) magnitude'.[4]

**Respondeo:** Dicendum, quod quamvis secundum rationem loquendi vel intelligendi a parte nostra *magnitudo* in divinis dicatur per modum quantitatis, et *deitas* per modum substantiae, tamen a parte rei nulla est omnino differentia. Nihil enim de magnitudine dicitur, quod non dicatur de substantia. In relatione[5] autem paternitatis non est ita. Aliquid enim praedicatur de paternitate, quod non potest dici de essentia, sicut distinguere et distingui.

**I respond:** It must be said, that although according to the reckoning of speaking and/or of understanding on our part "*magnitude*" among the divine is said through a manner of quantity, and "*deity*" through the manner of substance, yet on the part of the thing there is entirely no difference. For nothing is said of the magnitude, which is not said of the Substance. Moreover, in the relation[5] of paternity it is not thus. For something is predicated of the paternity, which cannot be said of the Essence, as "to distinguish" and "to be distinguished".

## Dub. IV.

## Doubt IV

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *In generatione generationum anni tui*.[6] Videtur enim male dicere, quia in aeternitate nulla cadit variatio: ergo cum annus variationem habeat, non debet transferri ibi.[7] *Item*, in illa aeternitate est omnimoda simplicitas et impartibilitas: ergo non deberet pluraliter dici *annos*.

Likewise is asked of this which (St. Augustine) says: *In the generation of generations Thy years*.[6] For he seems to speak badly, because in eternity there falls no variation: therefore since a year has a variation, it ought not be transferred There.[7] *Likewise*, in that eternity there is an omnimodal simplicity and impartibility: therefore *years* ought not to have been said in the plural.

**Respondeo:** Dicendum, quod iuxta modum nostrae infirmitatis et intelligimus divinam aeternitatem[8] et nominamus. Quoniam enim *annus* dicit completam temporis revolutionem secundum decursum solis in zodiaco et regressum ad idem punctum, et

**I respond:** It must be said, that according to the measure of our infirmity we both understand and name the divine eternity.[8] For since "*year*" means a complete revolution of time according to the discourse of the Sun in the Zodiac and (its)

divina aeternitas est perfecta et durationes ceteras circumplectens: ideo ad ipsam transtulit Scriptura nomen *anni*.

*Rursus*, quia interminata[9] et a parte *ante* et a parte *post*, ideo non *anuum* dicit, quasi terminum habeat, nec *generationem* singulariter, sed pluraliter *annos*, et *generationes* similiter. Ratione ergo perfectionis et interminationis transfertur, non ratione variationis.

## Dub. V.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *in generatione Sanctorum sunt anni Dei, aeternitas*. Videtur enim falsum, quia duratio Sanctorum est finita a parte ante; sed aeternitas Dei est infinita a parte ante et post: ergo Sancti non sunt in illa.[10] *Item*, quo modo essendi *in*[11] generatio Sanctorum est in illa? Sicut *mensura*, non, quia Dei aeternitas solius Dei est mensura; si sicut *causa* in effectu; sed hoc modo est in ceteris creaturis: ergo etc.

**Respondeo:** Dicendum, quod[12] illud verbum non est dictum per commensurationem neque per aequalitatem, sed per concomitantiam et conformitatem. Quia enim generatio Sanctorum a parte *post* durat in infinitum,[13] durat etiam sine variatione: ideo illam summam aeternitatem in aeternum comitatur et ei . . .

---

[1] Cod. O *sufficientior*.
[2] Nonnulli codd. ut I V Y Z *aeternitatem*.
[3] Vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 2.
[4] Vat. perperam et praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 ordinem invertit ponendo *quod sicut* loco *ita* et *sic est ista: Pater est magnus* pro *sicut et: Pater magnitudine*, quae et post *vel* repetit *Deus est*.
[5] Mendum Vat. *resolutione* correximus ex mss. et edd. 1, 2.
[6] Ita codd. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. cum ceteris edd. *In generatione et generationem anni tui*; ceterum vide supra textum Magistri, c. 1.
[7] Cod. dd *ad divina* pro *ibi*. Paulo infra Vat.

regression to the same point, and the divine eternity is perfect and encompasses all other durations. for that reason Scripture has transferred to it the name of "*year*".

*Again*, because (it[9] has) not been terminated, both on the part of a *before* and on the part of an *after*, for that reason he does not say *of years*, as if it had a terminus, nor a *generation* in the singular, but in the plural *years* and *generations* similarly. Therefore by reason of (its) perfection and non-termination it is transferred, but not by reason of variation.

## Doubt V

Likewise is asked of this which (St. Augustine) says, that *in the generation of the Saints are the years of God, eternity*. For it seems false, because the duration of the Saints is finite on the part of the "before" and the "after": therefore the Saints are not in that one.[10] *Likewise*, in what manner of being "*in*"[11] is the generation of the Saints in that one? As a *measure*? no, because God's eternity is the measure of God alone; if as a *cause* in an effect; but in this manner it is in all other creatures: ergo etc..

**I respond:** It must be said, that[12] that word has not been said through commensuration nor through equality, but through concomitance and conformity. For because the generation of the Saints on the part of the "*after*" lasts unto infinity,[13] it also lasts without variation: for that reason it accompanies [comitatur] that most high eternity forever and . . .

---

[1] Codex O has *more sufficient* [sufficientior].
[2] Not a few codices, such as I V Y and Z, have *eternity* [aeternitatem].
[3] See there the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2.
[4] The Vatican edition faultily and contrary to the testimony of the manuscripts and edition 1, inverts the order by putting *that just as* [quod sicut] in place of *thus* [ita] and *so is this: 'the Father is great'* [sic est ista: Pater est mangus] for *just as also: '(He is) the Father by (His) magnitude)'* [sicut et Pater magnitudine], which also after *and/or* [vel] repeats *God is* [Deus est].
[5] The error of the Vatican edition, which

falso *impartialitas* loco *impartibilitas*; obstant etiam plurimi mss. et ed. 1.
[8] Multi codd. contra contextum *Trinitatem* pro *aeternitatem*; Vat. cum uno alterover codice *Trinitatem vel aeternitatem*; lectio in textum recepta exhibetur a pluribus mss. ut H ee ff et ed. 1. Mox ex antiquioribus mss. supplevimus *enim*.
[9] Subintellige: aeternitas. — Pauci codd. ut H T adiiciunt *est*, cod. X *est duratio*.
[10] Nempe: aeternitate Dei. — Vat. absque auctoritate codd. et sex primarum edd., sensu eodem manente, *ergo illa non est Sanctis*.
[11] Cfr. supra q. 4. argum. 7. ad opp., ubi novem modi esendi *in* referuntur. Mox Vat. *est in illa generatione Sanctorum*, sed praeter fidem mss. et sex primarum edd., licet idem servetur sensus.
[12] Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *quod* et consequenter substituimus *est* loco *esse*.
[13] Cod. I cum ed. 1 addit *et*. Mox aliquid codd. ut T X cum ed. 1 *concomitatur* pro *comitatur*.

reads *resolution* [resolutione] for *relation* [relatione], we have corrected from the manuscripts and editions 1 and 2.
[6] Thus the codices, together with edition 1, while the Vatican edition, together with all the other editions reads *In generation and unto generation thy years* [In generatione et generationem anni tui]; otherwise see above the text of Master (Peter), ch 1.
[7] Codex dd has *to divine (things)* [ad divina] for *There* [ibi]. A little below this the Vatican edition falsely reads *impartiality* [impartialitas] for *impartibility* [impartibilitas]; very many manuscripts and edition 1 also withstand this.
[8] Many codices, contrary to the context, read *Trinity* [Trinitatem] for *eternity* [aeternitatem]; the Vatican edition, together with one or hte other codex, has *Trinity and/or eternity* [Trinitatem vel aeternitatem]; the reading received in the text is exhibited by many manuscripts, such as H ee and ff, and edition 1. Next from the more ancient manuscripts we have supplied *For* [enim].
[9] Understand: (the divine) eternity [aeternitas]. — A few codices, such as H and I, add *has* [est], codex X adds *the duration has* [est duratio].
[10] Namely: in that eternity of God. — The Vatican edition, without the authority of the codices and the six first editions, keeping the same sense, reads *therefore that one does not belong to the Saints* [ergo illa non est Sanctis].
[11] Cf. above q. 4, argument 7 in the Contrary, where the nine manners of being *in* are mentioned. Next the Vatican edition has *is it in that generation of the Saints* [est in illa generatione Sanctorum], but contrary to the testimony of the manuscripts and the six first editions, though it conserves the sense.
[12] Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *that* [quod] and consequently have replaced *has been* [esse] with *has been* [est].
[13] Codex I, together with edition 1, adds *and* [et]. Next some codices, such as T and X, together with edition 1 have *is concomitant to* [concomitatur] for *accompanies* [comitatur].

expresse conformatur; et ideo exponit illud Psalmi beatus Augustinus:[1] *In generatione generationum anni tui*: sive in generatione interminata, quae generatio est *Sancti*, sive Sancti sunt illa generatio, et quia in perpetuum durat, et quia ex multis generationibus sunt collecti.

is expressly conformed to it; and for that reason blessed Augustine[1] expounded that (verse) of the Psalm: *In the generation of generations Thy years*: whether (because these years are) in the un-terminated generation, which generation of *the Holy One*, or (because) the Saints are that generation, and because it lasts in perpetuity, and because they have been collected out of many generations.

## Dub. VI.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *Pater est in Filio et Filius in Patre*, quia, si quidquid est in Deo Deus est propter summam simplicitatem, ergo quidquid est in Filio est Filius: ergo si Pater est in Filio, Pater est Filius.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod non est simile, quia, cum dicitur aliquid esse in Deo, haec praepositio *in* aut dicit distinctionem *essentialem*, et sic non quidquid est in Deo, est Deus, quia nos *in Deo vivimus, movemur et sumus*;[2] aut *nullam* dicit distinctionem nisi secundum modum intelligendi, et hoc ponit omnimodam identitatem; et ideo sequitur, quod sit Deus quod est in Deo. Sed cum dicitur de *persona*, haec praepositio *in* dicit distinctionem personalem, et una persona de alia non praedicatur; et ideo patet, quod non est simile.[3]

## Doubt VI

Likewise is asked of this which (St. Hilary) says, that *the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father*, because, if whatever is in God is God on account of (His) most high simplicity, therefore whatever is in the Son is the Son: therefore if the Father is in the Son, the Father is the Son.

I respond: It must be said, that it is not similar, because, when there is said that something is in God, this preposition "*in*" either means an *essential* distinction, and thus not whatever is in God, is God, because we *in God live, move and are*;[2] or it means *no* distinction except according to a manner of understanding, and this posits an omnimodal identity; and for that reason it follows, that that which is in God is God. But when it is said of a *person*, this preposition "*in*" means a personal distinction, and one person is not predicated of another one; and for that reason it is clear, that it is not similar.[3]

## Dub. VII.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit Hilarius: *Nec exemplum rebus divinis comparatio humana praestabit*. Videtur enim falsum, quia *imago* est expressa similitudo, et *vestigium* est in omni creatura: ergo videtur, quod *exemplum* sit in omnibus.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod est exemplum *exprimens perfecte* et[4] consimiliter omnino, et tale nullum est in creaturis, quia *imago* et ceterae creturae plus habent dissimiliudinis quam similitudinis; et est exemplum aliquod modo *manducens*, et sic multa sunt, et ex multis colligitur unum, nec tamen omnino perfectum.

## Doubt VII

Likewise is asked of this which (St.) Hilary says: *Nor will a human comparison offer any example for divine things*. For it seems false, because an *image* is an expressed similitude, and a *vestige* is every creature: therefore it seems, that there is an *example* in all (things).

I respond: It must be said, that there is an example which *perfectly* and[4] in an entirely, completely similar manner *expresses* [exemplum exprimens perfecte et consimiliter omnino], and no such (example) is (found) among creatures, because an *image* and all the other creatures have more of a dissimilitude than of a similitude; and there is an example which *leads us by the hand* [exemplum manducens] in some manner, and in this manner there are many,

and one is gathered from many, and yet (it is) not entirely perfect.

## Dub. VIII.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Quod inintelligibile est homini possibile est Deo*. Videtur falsum, « quia anima nostra quodam modo est omnia »,[5] et intellectus noster non tot intelligit, quin plura possit intelligere.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod est loqui de intellectu *comprehendente*, et sic non est verum, quod omnia intelligere possit, quia nec Deus nec aliquid Dei, est comprehensibile nobis, quia omnino infinitus; et est loqui de intellectu *apprehendente*, et hoc dupliciter: aut in ratione *possibilis*[6] et suscipientis, et sic utique omne quod potest fieri, potest intelligere, quia possibile est ad intelligendum; aut in ratione *agentis*, et quia non habet lumen tantae potentiae, quod possit super omnia, scilicet praesentia et futura, quia multa sunt contra[7] eius iudicium, sic non est omnium.

## Doubt VIII

Likewise is asked of this which (St. Hilary) says: *What is unintelligible to man, for God is able to be*. It seems false, « because our soul is in a certain manner all (things) »,[5] and our intellect does not understand all, though [quin] it could understand more.

I respond: It must be said, that one can speak [est loqui] of the *comprehending* intellect, and thus it is not true, that it can understand all, because neither God nor something of God, is comprehensible to us, because (He is) entirely infinite; and one can speak of the *apprehending* intellect, and this in a twofold manner: either in the reckoning of the *possible*[6] and up-taking (intellect), and thus indeed everything which can come to be, it can understand, because the possible (intellect) is for understanding; or in the reckoning of an *agent* (intellect), and because it does not have a light of such a great power, that it can (act) upon all, namely, (things) present and future, because many are contrary to[7] its judgment, in this manner it does not belong to all.

## Dub. IX.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit Hilarius: *Nam si partem eiusdem, qui genuit, accepit, neuter perfectus est*. Videtur enim non sequi hoc, quia homo perfectus generat filium perfectum, et tamen non dat ei nisi partem.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod est perfectio *simpliciter*, et perfectio[8] *in genere*. Perfectio *in genere* bene compatitur secum dationem et receptionem partis, quia in dante suppletur per restaurationem, in accipiente per augmentum et additionem; sed perfectio *simpliciter* non compatitur secum restaurationem nec additionem. Et quoniam in Deo perfectio est simpliciter, ideo si daret partem, in dante remaneret defectus, similiter et in accipiente; ideo non est simile de homine.[9]

## Doubt IX

Likewise is asked of this which (St.) Hilary says: *For if He accepted part of the Same, who begot (Him), therefore Neither is perfect*. For it seems that this does not follow, because a perfect man generates a perfect son, and yet he does not give him but a part.

I respond: It must be said, that there is perfection *simply*, and perfection[8] *in (its) genus*. Perfection *in (its) genus* endures [compatitur secum] well a giving and reception of parts, because in the one giving (perfection) is supplied through a restoration, in the one accepting through augment and addition; but perfection *simply* does not endure a restoration nor an addition. And since in God there is perfection simply, for that reason if He would give part (of Himself), in the One giving there would remain a defect, similarly in the one accepting; for that reason it is not similar concerning a man.[9]

## Dub. X.

## Doubt X

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Non per duplicem convenientium generum coniunctionem* etc.; . . .

[1] Enarratio in Psalm. 101. Serm. 2. n. 11: De tot generationibus colliges omnes sanctas proles omnium generationum, et facies inde unam generationem. *In* ista *generatione generationum anni tui*, id est, aeternitas illa in illa generatione erit, quae de omnibus generationibus colligitur et in unam redigitur; ipsa particeps erit aeternitatis tuae. Ceterae generationes implendis temporibus generantur, ex quibus illa in aeternum regeneratur; mutata vivificabitur, erit idonea portare te, vires accipiens a te. *In generatione generationum anni tui*. — Vat. hic sicuti et supra in dub. 4. contra codd. et ed. 1 *In generatione et generationem anni tui*, quae et paulo ante addit *sic* post *ideo*, ad dein *Sanctorum sive* pro *Sancti sive* ponit contra mss. et ed. 1. Mox cod. I *durant* et cod. dd *durant beati* loco *durat*, qui et in fine responsionis adiungit *et hic est intellectus huius propositionis*. — Idem dubium solvitur a B. Albert., hic a. 6.

[2] Act. 17, 28. — Paulo infra cod. T *quod sic Deus est in Deo* loco *quod sit Deus quod est in Deo*.

[3] Cfr. supra q. 4. ad 1. et Scholion.

[4] Ex mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 supplevimus *et*. Plures codd. ut C L O R S U V *similiter* pro *consimiliter*. — Cfr. de hac divisione pag. 94. dub. 4.

[5] Aristot., III. de Anima, text. 37 (c. 8).

[6] Vat. cum cod. cc *possibilitas*, sed contra alios codd. et ed. 1. Paulo post fide plurium mss. ut I S T Y Z bb et ed. 1 restituimus particulam *utique*.

[7] Vat., obnitentibus mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6, *supra*. In lectione codicum intelligas locutionem *contra iudicium rationis* de *ratione inferiori* et conversa ad sensibilia, ut ipse S. Doctor praeclare explicat III. Sent. d. 23. a. 1. q. 1. ad 4. — Plura de intellectu comprehendente et apprehendente vide supra d. 3. p. I. q. 1. ad 1; de intellectu possibili et agente II. Sent. d. 24. p. I.a. 2. q. 4, et Aristot., III. de Anima, text. 1-20 (c. 4. et 5.). — In cod. O in fine responsionis additur *quia non habet tantum lumen intellectuale, quod possit omnia intellecta in potentia facere intellecta in actu*.

[8] In pluribus mss. ut A F G I S T W Y etc. et ed. 1 deest *perfectio*.

[9] Ex multis mss. ut A F G I M N P Q T U Z ee ff et ed. 1 adiecimus verba *ideo non est simile de homine*.

Likewise is asked of this which (St. Hilary) says: *Not through a twofold conjunction of convening genera* etc.; . . .

[1] Ennarations on the Psalms, Psalm 101, Sermon 2, n. 11: From all the generations Though shall gather all the holy offspring of all the generations, and Thou shalt make of them one generation. *In* that *generation of generations Thy years*, that is, that eternity shall be in that generation, which is gathered from all generations and is brought back into one; that shall be the share of Thy eternity. All other generations are generated with seasons being fulfilled, out of which that one is regenerated in eternity; what has changed shall be vivified; it shall be fit to bear Thee, accepting strengths from Thee. *In the generation of generations Thy years*. — The Vatican edition, just as also above here in dubium 4, contrary to the codices and to edition 1, reads *In generation and unto generation Thy years* [In generatione et generationem anni tui], which also a little above this adds *thus* [sic] after *for that reason* [ideo], and then it puts *of the Saints or* [Sanctorum sive] for *of the Holy One or* [Sancti sive], contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1. Next codex I has *they last* [durant] and codex dd *the blessed last* [Durant beati] in place of *it lasts* [durat], which also and the end of the response adds *and this is the understanding of this proposition* [et hic est intellectus huius propositionis]. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus) solves the same doubt, here in a. 6.

[2] Acts 17:28. — A little below this codex T has *that in this manner God is in God* [quod sic Deus est in Deo] in place of *that that which is in God is God* [quod sit Deus quod est in Deo].

[3] Cf. above q. 4, in reply to n. 1 and in the Scholium.

[4] From the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, and 6, we have supplied *and* [et]. Very many codices, such as C L O R S U V, have *similar* [similiter] for *completely similar* [consimiliter]. — Cf. concerning this division, (d. 3, p. II), dubium 4, p. 94.

[5] Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. III, text 37. (ch. 8).

[6] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, reads *possibility* [possibilitas] for *of the possible* [possibilis], but contrary to the other codices and to edition 1. A little after this, trusting in very many manuscripts, such as I S T Y Z bb, and in edition 1, we have restored the particle *indeed* [utique].

[7] The Vatican edition, with the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3 and 6 striving against this, reads *above* [supra] for *contrary to* [contra]. In the reading of the codices understand the saying *contrary to the judgment of reason* as concerning *the inferior reason* and that turned toward sensibles, as the Seraphic Doctor himself explains very clearly in Sent., Bk. III, d. 23, a. 1, q. 1, in reply to n. 4. — See more on the comprehending and apprehending intellect above in d. 3, p. I, q. 1, in reply to n. 1; on the possible and agent intellect, Sent, Bk. II, d. 24, p. I, a. 2, q. 4, and Aristotle, On the Soul, bk. III, texts 1-20 (chs. 4 and 5). — In codex O at the end of the response there is added *because it has not so great an intellectual light, which can cause all (to be) intellected in*

*potency intellected in act* [quia non habet tantum lumen intellectuale, quod possit omnia intellecta in potentia facere intelelcta in actu].

[8] In very many manuscripts, such as A F G I S T W Y etc., and in edition 1, there is lacking *perfection* [perfectio].

[9] From many manuscripts, such as A F G I M N P Q T U Z ee and ff, and edition 1, we have inserted the words *for that reason it is not similar concerning a man* [ideo non est simile de homine].

---

***p. 353***

aut enim tangit modos *essendi*, aut *generandi*. Non *essendi*, quia multo plures sunt quam isti; non *generandi*; et ita[1] utroque modo est insufficiens.

either he touches upon manners of *being*, or of *being generated*. Not of *being*, because there are much more than those; not of *being generated*; and thus it is insufficient in[1] each manner.

RESPONDEO: Aliqui dicunt, quod Hilarius assignat hos[2] modos generationis, qui sunt in creaturis, ut excludat eos a Filio. Sed non assignat nisi duos modos, quia non loquitur nisi de generatione vivi; vivens autem generabile dividitur in vegetabile et sensibile; et secundum illud duplex genus duplex est modus generandi quid tangit Hilarius. Nam animalia generatur per[3] coniunctionem maris et feminae, et plantae per insertum. Primum tangit cum dicitur: «Non per duplicem *convenientiem generum* », quia masculus et femina sunt duplicis *generis* quantum ad sexum, et tamen *convenientes* sunt quantum ad formam et naturam.[4] Secundum modum tangit cum dicit: « Nec per insitvam capacioris substantiae naturam », sicut surculus inseritur arbori, « sed per naturae unitam similitudinem », id est similitudinem omnino in natura indifferentem.[5]

I RESPOND: Some say, that (St.) Hilary assigns those[2] manners of generation, which are in creatures, to exclude those from the Son. But he does not assign but two manners, because he does not speak but of the generation of a living (thing); but a "living thing which can be generated" [vivens generabile] is divided into the vegetable and sensible; and according to that twofold genus, is the twofold manner of being generated, which (St.) Hilary touches upon. For animals are generated through[3] a conjunction of male and female, and plants through being inserted [per insertum]. He touches upon the first, when there is said: « Not through a twofold (conjunction) *of convening genera* », because "masculine" and "feminine" belong to a twofold *genus*, as much as regards sex, and yet are *convening* as much as regards form and nature.[4] He touches upon the second manner when he says: « Nor through the engrafted nature of a more capable substance », just as a young shoot [surculus] is inserted into a tree, « but through the united similitude of nature », that is (through) a similitude entirely un-differing in nature.[5]

Aliter potest dici, quod Hilarius non loquitur de modo[6] generandi, sed loquitur, quomodo Pater sit in Filio; et excludit modum essendi *in*, quo creatura dicitur esse in creatura secundum modum usitatum; ad quem modum concurrit duplex conditio creaturarum:* prima est creaturarum[7] quoad naturam diversitas; secunda est continentis capacitas. Et hac excludit ab illo

In another manner it can be said, that (St.) Hilary does not speak of the manner[6] of being generated, but speaks, according to the manner in which [quomodo] the Father is in the Son; and he excludes the manner of being *in*, whereby a creature is said to be in a creature according to the usual manner; to which manner there concurs a twofold condition of creatures:* the first is

modo existendi, qui est in divinis, per illa duo, quae dicit: « Quod Filius est in Patre non per coniunctionem duorum generum, neque per insitivam capacioris substantiae naturam ». Hoc patet per litteram Hilarii,[8] quam immediate subiungit in originali, et Magister omittit: « Quia, inquit Hilarius, per corporalem necessitatem exteriora fieri his, quibus continentur, interiora non possunt », et[9] vult, quod illud est impossibile in creaturis corporalibus, quod mutuo sint in se ipsis, sicut Pater est in Filio; quia propter corporalem necessitatem et imperfectionem interiora non possunt fieri exteriora his quibus continentur, ut si aqua est intus[10] in vase, dum est intus, non potest fieri extra, et ita non continetur vas, ut vas sit in aqua.

the diversity of creatures[7] in regard to nature; the second is the capacity of the one containing. And he excludes the former from that manner of existing, which is among the divine, through those two, which he says: « That the Son is in the Father not through a conjunction of two genera, not through the engrafted nature of a more capable substance ». This is clear through the text of (St.) Hilary,[8] which he immediately subjoins in the original, and (which) Master (Peter) omits: « Because », says (St.) Hilary, « through corporal necessity exterior (things can) come to be from those, which are contained, interior ones cannot »; and[9] he would have it [vult], that it is impossible in corporal creatures, that they be mutually in themselves, as the Father is in the Son; because on account of corporal necessity and imperfection interiors cannot become exteriors to those which are contained, as if water is inside [intus][10] in a vase, while it is inside, it cannot come to be outside, and thus a vase is not contained, as a vase is in water.

## Dub. XI.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Dum naturam Dei non degenerat nativitas*, quia non tantum in Deo, sed in creaturis pluribus non degenerat.

**Respondeo:** Dicendum, quod *degenerare* est extra genus generantis exire. Exire autem extra genus generantis hoc est: aut quantum ad *communem*[11] *formam* et naturam; et sic est degeneratio in aequivocis, sicut equus ex asina generat burdonem, et asinus ex equa mulum, unde mulus degenerat. Alio modo *degenerare* est proprietates generantis relinquere, *retenta natura*, sicut filius, qui generatur ex patre nobili et pulcro, est rusticanus[12] et turpis. Tertio modo est *degenerare* naturam generantis relinquere, non per dissimilitudinem, sed per *diversitatem*: et hoc modo omnis nativitas creata degenerat, quia in omni creatura generans est aliud a generato,[13] et sola divina generatio est, quae non degenerat, quia nihil nascitur novum, nihil additur alienum, et ideo generans a generato in substantia non separatur, et ideo illa generatio sola est nobilissima.[14]

## Doubt XI

Likewise is asked of this which (St. Hilary) says: *While the nativity does not degenerate the Nature of God*, because not only in God, but in many creatures it does not degenerate (the nature).

**I respond:** It must be said, that "*to degenerate*" is "to go forth outside of the genus of the one generating". Moreover "to go forth outside of the genus of the one generating" is this: either as much as regards the *common*[11] *form* and nature; and thus there is a degeneration in equivocal (terms), just as a male horse [equus] generates a hinny [burdonem] from a female donkey [asina], and a male donkey, a mule from a female horse [equa], whence the mule degenerates. In another manner "*to degenerate*" is "to relinquish the properties of the one generating, *with the nature retained*", just a son, who is generated from a noble and handsome father, is homely and ugly [rusticanus et turpis].[12] In a third manner "*to degenerate*" is "to relinquish the nature of the one generating", not through dissimilitude, but through *diversity*: and in this manner every created nativity degenerates, because in

every creature the one generating is other than the one generated,[13] and the divine generation alone is, that which does not degenerate, because nothing new is born, nothing added from another, and for that reason the One generating is not separated in substance from the One generated, and for that reason that generation alone is most noble.[14]

---

* Textus criticalis perperam legivit *craturarum* pro *creaturarum*.
[1] Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 expunximus additum *in*.
[2] Unus alterove codex ut G cum ed. 1 *hic* loco *hos*.
[3] Pauci mss. ut G H et ed. 1 *ex coniunctione*. Mox Vat. contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 post *insertum* adiicit *Et*. Dein aliqui codd. ut F G H cum ed. 1 *dicit* loco *dicitur*.
[4] Ex plurimis mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *naturam* loco *materiam*. Paulo post aliqui codd. ut aa bb *dicitur* pro *dicit*.
[5] Vat. *similitudinem non in natura differentem*; sed obstat auctoritas vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1. — Praedictam expositionem huius loci praebent B. Albert., hic art. 10; S. Thom. et Richard., hic circa lit.
[6] Nonnulli codd. ut F G cum ed. 1 *modis*.
[7] In Vat. deest *creaturarum*, quod tamen exstat in mss. et ed. 1.
[8] Libr. VII. de Trin. n. 39. — Ed. 1 cum uno alterove codices *Et hoc* pro *Hoc*. Mox ex pluribus mss. ut A H K T Y Z etc. et ed. 1 *quam* loco *quoniam* substituimus.
[9] Plurimi mss. cum ed. 1 exhibent particulam *et*, quae deest in Vat.
[10] Sequimur antiquiores codd. cum ed. 1 addendo *intus*, quorum tamen aliqui ut F G I S V W aa omittunt *in*.
[11] In cod. T deest *communem*.
[12] Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis tamen mss. et ed. 1 refragantibus *rusticus*. Paulo ante cod. T *matre* pro *pulcro*. Mox post *Tertio* ex nonnullis mss. ut P Q dd supplevimus *modo*. Dein post *degenerare* cod. dd addit *id quod*, pro quo plures codd. ut A F G H P Q T Z ee ff cum ed. 1 minus bene *id est*, aliqui autem ut S V *et*.
[13] Mendum Vat. et cod. cc *generante* pro *generato* hic et paulo infra ex aliis mss. et ed. 1 castigavimus. Paulo ante cod. T cum ed. 1 *creato* loco *creatura* et cod. Y *alius* pro *aliud*. Mox pro lectione Vat. *et in sola divina generatione degeneratio non est* fide fere omnium antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *et sola divina generatio est, quae non degenerat*; in qua propositione codd. O Y ponunt *sed* loco *et*, ac cod. I *quae non degenerata est* pro *quae non degenerat*.
[14] Cfr. B. Albert., hic a. 11.

* The critical edition faultily has *of bowls* [craturarum] for *of creatures* [creaturarum].
[1] Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged the added *in* [in, which however is required in English].
[2] One or the other codex, such as G, together with edition 1, has *here the* [hic] for *those* [hos].
[3] A few manuscripts, such as G and H, and edition 1, have *out of* [per]. next the Vatican edition, contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1, adds *And* [Et] at the beginning of the next sentence. Then some codices, such as F G and H, together with edition 1, have *he says* [dicit] for *there is said* [dicitur].
[4] From very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *nature* [naturam] in place of *matter* [materiam]. A little after this some codices, such as aa and bb, read *there is said* [dicitur] for *he says* [dicit].
[5] The Vatican edition reads *(through) a similitude not differing in nature* [similitudinem non in natura differentem]; but the authority of the older manuscripts and editin 1 withstand this. — The aforesaid exposition of this passage is offered by Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 10; St. Thomas and Richard (of Middleton), here on the text.
[6] Not a few codices, such as F and G, together with edition 1, have *manners* [modis].
[7] In the Vatican edition there is lacking *of creatures* [creaturarum], which, however, is extant in the manuscripts and edition 1.
[8] <u>On the Trinity</u>, Bk. VII, n. 39. — Edition 1, together with one or the other codices, reads *And this* [Et hoc] for *This* [Hoc]. Next from very many manuscripts, such as A H K T Y Z etc. and edition 1, we have substituted *which* [quam] in place of *since* [quoniam].
[9] Very many manuscripts, together with edition 1, exhibit the particle *and* [et], which is lacking in the Vatican edition.
[10] We follow the more ancient codices together with edition 1 by adding *inside* [intus], some of which, however, such as F G I S V W and aa, omit *in* [in].
[11] In codex T there is lacking *the common* [communem].
[12] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, however, breaking with the other manuscripts and edition 1, has *homely* [rusticus]. A little before this, codex T has *from a noble father and mother* [ex patre nobile et matre] for *from a noble and handsome father* [ex patre nobile et pulcro]. Next after *In a third* [Tertio], we have supplied from not a few manuscripts, such as P Q and dd, *manner*

[modo]. Then after *"to degenerate" is* [est degenerare] codex dd adds *that which (is)* [id quod], in place of which very many codices, such as A F G H P Q T Z ee and ff, together with edition 1, have less well *In a third manner there is "to degenerate" that is* [Tertio modo est degenerare id est], but some, such as S and V, have *In the third manner "to degenerate" is also* [Tertio modo est degenerare et].

[13] The error of the Vatican edition and codex cc, *the one generating* [generante] for *the one generated* [generato], here and a little below this, we have corrected from the other manuscripts and edition 1. A little before this codex T, together with edition 1, has *every nativity degenerates by (something) created* [omnis nativitas creato degenerat] and codex Y has the masculine form for *other* [aliud] rather than the neuter form. Next in place of the reading of the Vatican edition, *and in the divine generation alone there is no degeneration* [et in sola divina generatione degeneration non est], trusting in nearly all the more ancient manuscripts and in edition 1, we have substituted *and the divine generation alone is, that which does not degenerate* [et sola divina generatio est, quae non degenerat]; in which proposition codices O and Y put *but* [sed] in place of *and* [et], and codex I has *which has not degenerated* [quae non degenerate est] for *which does not degenerate* [quae non degenerat].

[14] Cf. Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 1.

---